DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 627 UD 027 892

TITLE Bigotry and Violence on American College Campuses.
INSTITUTION Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 87p.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Hearings; *Higher Education; Homosexuality; *Intergroup Relations; *Minority Groups; Racial Discrimination; *Social Discrimination; *Violence

ABSTRACT

This document contains testimony presented at a briefing on bigotry and violence on college campuses in the United States. Eight witnesses, including college educators and students, presented information about the extent and causes of, and possible solutions to, the apparent increase in the number of incidents. Panelists varied slightly in their perception of which group or groups are the primary victims of campus bigotry, but all agreed that a serious problem existed. They differed in their interpretation of how bigotry is expressed, varying from open harassment of minority group members to insensitivity resulting in strained racial relations. Although the number of incidents and "alerts" (i.e., formal notifications of tensions or conflicts) reported to various public and private agencies has increased significantly over the past five years, panelists were divided as to the reasons for the increase. The following causes of campus bigotry were cited: (1) deficiencies on college campuses that exacerbate existing tensions; (2) society's failure to keep up with change; (3) competition for limited resources; and (4) extremist speakers. Recommendations for improvement fell into the following categories: (1) on-campus and off-campus resources; (2) multicultural training; (3) federal support and involvement; and (4) the dilemma of balancing free speech with restrictions on inflammatory speech. A list of 16 papers presented at the briefing is appended. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327627

Bigotry and Violence On American College Campuses

United States Commission on Civil Rights
October 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is a temporary, independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957, reestablished in 1983, and directed to:

- Investigate coma denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;
- Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin;
- Serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin;
- Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and Congress.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Arthur A. Fletcher, *Chairman*
Charles Pei Wang, *Vice Chairman*
William B. Allen
Carl A. Anderson
Mary Frances Berry
Esther G. Buckley
Blandina Cardenas Ramirez
Russell G. Redenbaugh

Wilfredo J. Gonzalez, *Staff Director*

Bigotry and Violence On American College Campuses

United States Commission on Civil Rights
October 1990

Preface

The following contains the transcript and summary report of a briefing conducted by the Campus bigotry Subcommittee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to address bigotry and violence on college campuses. The briefing was held at Commission headquarters, 1121 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., on May 18, 1989, at 2:00 p.m. Present for the briefing were Murray Friedman, former Vice Chairman; Commissioner Esther G. Buckley; former Commissioners Francis S. Guess and Sherwin T.S. Chan; and Melvin L. Jenkins, former acting staff director.

Acknowledgments

This report was written by Lallie P. Dawson. It was prepared under the overall supervision of Barbara J. Brooks, Acting Chief of the Congressional and Public Affairs Unit. Editorial review was provided by Carol-Lee Hurley, Acting Chief of the Regional Program Coordination Unit. Valuable support services were provided by Deborah Glispie.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

1. Introduction 1
2. The Extent of the Problem 3
3. Causes of the Problem 7
4. Recommended Solutions 12

BRIEFING

Welcome and Introductory Remarks
Subcommittee Chairman Murray Friedman 19
Presentations:
Session 1 - The extent of the problem:
Grace Flores-Hughes, Director,
Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice, accompanied by Judith Kruger, Conciliation Specialist 21
Dr. Jeffrey Ross, Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith 24
Dr. Stephen Balch, National Association of Scholars 28
Session 2 - Causes of the problem:
Dr. Reginald Wilson, Senior Scholar, Office of Minority Concerns, American Council on Education 43
Patrick Cheng, Campuses Against Racist Violence . . 48
Dr. Thomas Short, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Kenyon College 53
Session 3 - Solutions:
Irving Levine, National Affairs Director, American Jewish Committee 38
Dr. Robert Dunham, Vice President and Vice Provost, Penn State University 58
Roundtable Discussion 63

APPENDIX

Chapter 1

Introduction

On May 18, 1989, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held a briefing on "Bigotry and Violence on College Campuses" in Washington, D.C., at the Commission's headquarters. The forum met to assess what is happening at American institutions of higher learning and discuss possible solutions to the problem.

Commission Vice Chairman and Subcommittee Chairman Murray Friedman introduced the panelists, expressing his concern about the apparent increase in the number of incidents of bigotry and violence on college campuses. In 1988, Commissioner Friedman introduced a resolution requesting a Commission briefing on the subject. As a result, a written briefing was produced by Commission staff in December 1988.[1] In March 1989, Commissioner Friedman introduced a second resolution to hold a formal briefing, which resulted in the panel and roundtable described in this summary.

During the 3-hour briefing, participants presented information to address the extent, causes, and possible solutions to bigotry and violence on college campuses.

Grace Flores-Hughes, director of the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Relations Service (CRS), and Judith Kruger, a conciliation specialist for the CRS in Region III, opened the briefing. Other presenters were Dr. Jeffrey Ross, director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith's department of campus affairs/higher education; Irving Levine, national affairs director of the American Jewish Committee; Dr. Stephen H. Balch of the National Association of Scholars and Chairman of the Commission's New Jersey Advisory Committee; Dr. Reginald Wilson, senior scholar for the American Council on Education's Office of Minority Concerns; Patrick Cheng, a junior at Yale College and member of Campuses Against Racist Violence; Dr. Robert Dunham, vice president and vice provost of Pennsylvania State University; and Dr. Thomas Short, associate professor of philosophy at Kenyon College.

---

[1] "Briefing on Bias-Related Incidents on College Campuses," prepared for the Commissioners by the USCCR's Congressional and Public Affairs Division, December 1988.

Their presentations were followed by a roundtable discussion with the Commissioners to clarify issues raised and to address how the Commission might help solve the problem.

The Commission thanks each panelist for his or her time and effort, without which this briefing would not have been possible.

Chapter 2

The Extent of the Problem

Although it is impossible to measure with precision the extent of the problem of racial bigotry on college campuses in the United States, this chapter reviews the limited statistical data and shares the perceptions of the experts who provided information at the briefing.

Who experiences campus bigotry?

The panelists varied slightly in their perception of which group or groups are the primary victims of campus bigotry.

Dr. Reginald Wilson of the American Council on Education asserted that the majority of incidents are directed toward black students, "subsequently against Asians and Hispanics, and against Jews." He based this opinion on statistics compiled by the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Relations Service (CRS), the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, and the Center for the Study and Prevention of Campus Violence located at Towson State University. Meanwhile, Irving Levine of the American Jewish Committee advised the Commission that "[t]hose of us who think the black-white dichotomy defines American ethnic relations had better take another look."

Mr. Levine also told the Commission that the New York City Board of Higher Education requires every school to work on multiculturalism and pluralism and develop consistent policies. This developed as a result of 20 years of forging a coalition of blacks, Jews, Hispanics, and other ethnic groups. Mr. Levine felt that all groups, even white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, must be included when examining the pluralistic nature of the population.

Patrick Cheng, a member of Campuses against Racist Violence, recommended that homosexuals be included under the definition of incidents of racist violence. "Violence against gays is going to be a major issue in the next 5 or 10 years. . . . Just because it is not explicitly listed under Title VI or Title IX doesn't mean that you can ignore it. . . ."[2]

Dr. Jeffrey Ross of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith informed the Commission that not all incidents involve majority

[2] Patrick Cheng; briefing held by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in Washington, D.C., May 18, 1989 (cited hereafter as USCCR Briefing).

versus minority scenarios. Some are minority versus minority conflicts, he said.

All panelists agreed that there is a problem and offered their perception of what the causes and possible solutions might be.

How is bigotry manifested on college campuses?

The panelists, while sharing the belief that there is a problem, differed in their interpretation of how bigotry on American college campuses is expressed.

Dr. Thomas Short of Kenyon College addressed the "mistake" of lumping together racial hostility and insensitivity, saying that "[i]nsensitivity of whites toward blacks is rooted less in prejudice than in unfamiliarity and curiosity and simple lack of tact. . . . I have heard black students complain in private, rarely in public, until recently, about white students who either stereotype them or exhibit an annoying curiosity."

Dr. Short predicted, "We shall see, too, another manifestation, not exactly of insensitivity, but of strained racial relations; namely, whites avoiding blacks for fear of saying or doing the wrong thing."

Dr. Robert Dunham, vice president and vice provost of Pennsylvania State University, reminded the Commission that acts of bigotry can take a more sinister tone. He said that at Penn State during the 1988-89 school year, acts of racism and bigotry took the form of racist slurs and posters, racial harassment, and alleged racial intimidation; anti-Semitic remarks, graffiti, and posters; and harassment and threatening statements toward lesbians and gays. According to Dr. Dunham, someone used a computer network to transmit the statement, "Why Should One Kill Homosexuals?" to all parts of the country and some places abroad.

Dr. Ross and Dr. Wilson said that most college administrators fail to recognize that most of the incidents indicate the breakdown of human relations; instead, colleges choose to view the incidents as public relations problems. According to Dr. Wilson, this misperception makes institutions that subscribe to this attitude appear responsive only to demands they view as potentially embarrassing. He offered, as an example, that the University of Michigan, after protest marches on campus, made efforts to increase opportunities for minorities by increasing the number of doctoral students. Also, Dr. Wilson said that the University of Michigan hired 18 black tenure track faculty, more than it had ever done in any one academic year in its history.

What is the frequency?

Statistics provided by the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Relations Service (CRS) and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith corroborate the panelists' and the media's perception that incidents of campus bigotry are increasing.

Dr. Stephen H. Balch of the National Association of Scholars warned against drawing the conclusion that the incidence of racist violence is increasing without hard data, and encouraged other jurisdictions to do as the State of New Jersey had done. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights's New Jersey Advisory Committee encouraged the State of New Jersey to collect systematically statistics on incidents having to do with hate crimes.[3]

According to the Department of Justice, requests for assistance to the Justice Department's Community Relations Service (CRS) since 1986 have increased significantly: from 1987 to 1988, the number of alerts (formal notifications of tensions or conflicts) filed went from 48 to 77.[4]

In 1988, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith noted that the incidence of anti-Semitism on campus since 1987 escalated from a steady increase during the previous 5-year period to a dramatic 271 percent increase.[5]

Why are there more reported incidents now?

Several explanations were offered to explain why more incidents were reported in the late 1980s. The panelists addressed the inevitable question, are there more cases or are we just finding more cases because we are looking for them? Also, why are there more cases now? Has anything different been happening the last few years?

According to Dr. Balch, over the years society has widened its notion of what constitutes harassment and victimization. He said that during the late 1970s and 1980s, the number of groups considered targets and the types of acts considered offensive have multiplied.

---

[3] See also "Hate Crimes Resolution," issued Feb. 12, 1988, by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights calling on Congress to enact legislation requiring the Attorney General to collect data about hate crimes; the Hate Crimes Statistics Act passed by the U.S. House of Representatives May 1988; and the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1989 (Section 3e "Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics") (HR 3344), introduced Sept. 26, 1989. On April 23, 1990, the President signed into law the Hate Crime Statistics Act (Pub. L. No. 101-275).

[4] Grace Flores-Hughes, USCCR Briefing.

[5] Jeffrey Ross, USCCR Briefing.

Dr. Balch proposed that increased sensitivity may have provided greater incentives to report incidents and that a greater interest in changing campus policies exists today. "Add to that an element of self-fulfilling prophecy: The more people sense that there is racial tension the more racial tension actually exists; things happen that might not otherwise."

Dr. Short noted, "If there is more insensitivity now than before, I suspect it is due to an additional third factor, an exaggerated fear of giving offense."

The press is giving more attention to the situation now than before. Careful examination reveals several significant incidents prior to 1987: the hazing at the Citadel (1986), the attack by white baseball fans upon blacks at the University of Massachusetts (1986), and the antiblack behavior at the University of Michigan. But were these isolated incidents or evidence of ongoing conditions?

Dr. Ross compared the sudden awareness to the sudden appearance of a pothole—one day you don't see it, the next day you do. "What happened yesterday to create the hole in the ground? What you have had for years and years is subsurface erosion. The hole in the ground wasn't created yesterday. It only appeared today."

Chapter 3

The Causes of the Problem

The panelists cited a number of causes of campus bigotry. The causes fell into four categories: 1) deficiencies on college campuses that exacerbate existing tensions; 2) society's failure to keep up with change; 3) competition for limited resources; and 4) extremist speakers.

Deficiencies on campus that exacerbate existing tensions

Several panelists focused on local campus conditions that not only prevent the improvement of race relations, but also encourage racial conflict. They include campus environments perceived as hostile, isolation of many minorities on college campuses, perceived issues of recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty, perceived exclusion of minority cultures from the curriculum, defunding or deemphasis of special programs that target minorities, and perceived institutional discouragement of minority students from entering or continuing academic studies in certain disciplines.

Dr. Balch pointed out the uniqueness of college campuses. Although they are places where people work and live together, they are not permanent communities. He described them as communities where people stay for a while and move on. Therefore, the incentive to cooperate and coexist amicably that might exist in permanent communities does not exist on college campuses.

Mr. Cheng discussed a lack of responsibility by universities for the students' welfare. "Universities used to take more care of the students, being responsible for their actions, acting as their parents *in absentia*." He also said that, now that legal responsibility has been removed, universities are under no obligation to resolve conflicts between groups and often tell the disputing parties they have to find their own solutions.

Dr. Short condemned college administrators for not being "swifter and firmer" in punishing racial violence. He said that hostile acts are increasing as an expression of prejudice learned on campus out of resentment of perceived preferential treatment of minorities and of false accusations of racism rather than an expression of prejudice that whites bring with them to college. Also, he argued that there's a "lack of prior commitment to the genuine ideals of equality" that allows resentment to occur. Dr.

Short offered that it is possible to oppose affirmative action without expressing the opposition as a racial insult.

Dr. Wilson pointed out that racism on college campuses originates and exists in "the administration, in the faculty, in the curriculum, and in the practices that all of those individuals engage in. That is where it begins and that is where attitudes are created."

Dr. Wilson also stated that institutions are not interested in training faculty and students in dispute resolution or sensitivity. He said that there are plenty of people who are "very able and available to teach them."

Most institutions, Dr. Wilson said, do not have sanctions or policies against this kind of behavior, and are even ambivalent about the need to develop them. "One would expect that campus leaders would hope that it would simply go away. Much of what is happening is a consequence of great denial," he said.

Dr. Balch discussed the effects of applying different admissions standards. He advised administrators to examine how admissions policies function and how students on both sides of the policies perceive their fairness and equity.

According to Dr. Wilson, "Very little recruitment of any kind is going on in graduate schools and in professional schools, and the numbers are showing that. In 1975 there were 1,213 doctorates awarded to black Americans. In 1987 there were 725. Institutions are not making any significant efforts to recruit minority scholars. I think. . . .that it's nothing less than disgraceful."

Most of the panelists agreed that people are reacting to things that previously did not bring forth a reaction. Dr. Ross said that victims' voices are louder. Also, he said that white students are expressing antagonism toward affirmative action policies and recipients. He suggested that administrators should be more responsible for setting the moral tone on campus against intolerant and racist behavior.

Society's failure to keep up with change

Three other causes reflect society's failure to adapt to changing conditions. Panelists discussed the effects of simple ignorance or insensitivity, more minority students on campuses, and societal changes and the breakdown of traditional supports.

Simple ignorance or insensitivity

Although national findings show that society is becoming more tolerant of differences than ever before, Mr. Levine said that the American Jewish Committee notices that the behavior of high school students is " outrageous. They are philosophically tolerant and behavioristically outrageous. They are acting out against

each other. There is a large-scale lack of respect for each other, lack of respect for self, reported everywhere." He said that many students have weak self-identities and an inadequate sense of group identity that contribute largely to their behavior problems.

Mr. Levine noted that, although the college years are the "up" years of life—the "free spirits" of youth—they are also years in which passions are less governable. Students tend to give way to things that adults would be able to contain, he said.

Also, he said that this is the first generation to have missed the civil rights struggles of the 1960s and into the mid-1970s. Students question the reasons behind affirmative action, he said. They do not see it as a means of giving minorities a fair chance to achieve, but rather as a means of taking away opportunities from the majority, according to Mr. Levine.

Mr. Levine also noted that multicultural training and staff development is not as prevalent on college campuses as it is in elementary and secondary school systems. "It is difficult for people who are overwhelmed educationally by all kinds of other needs and demands to pay attention to something as essential as good intergroup relations and healthy group identity when they are fearful and there are inadequate possibilities of training them. . . . Mixing does not automatically create good will. It helps. Intentional programming on group relations creates it."

More minority students

Since the 1960s, American college campuses have experienced the development of a critical mass of students from a variety of minority groups. As those minority groups gain confidence in their existence on previously all-white campuses, they approach the administrators to make demands. In recent years, when these students make demands, conflict has erupted.

Dr. Ross and Dr. Wilson agreed that part of the problem is due to the fact that there are minorities on campus. "There would be no problem if they were not there," noted Dr. Wilson. The increased numbers of minorities on campuses today compared to the early days of school integration allows for the possibility of demonstrations, they said. Some of the issues of race relations being protested have been on the campuses all along, but only recently has there been a "critical mass" to respond.

Dr. Ross noted that "an attack on one minority will inevitably lead to a circumstance in which other minorities become vulnerable. . . . Therefore it is no accident that the increased levels of anti-Semitism on campus are directly related to and exist in a climate of increasing numbers of instances of racial and ethnic bigotry and prejudice on campus."

Societal changes and the breakdown of traditional supports

Commissioner Chan commented that the stated causes of conflict on campuses—drugs, alcohol, racism—reflect the causes of conflict in society in general. Did the presenters agree with the statement?

Dr. Ross mentioned these elements as causes in his remarks, and Mr. Levine felt strongly about the connection, saying that "the extremes of acting out behavior flow over into racial, ethnic, and religious intolerance. We are seeing a lot of so-called innocent acting out that comes from broken family life, beginning to become part of the index in this field. We ought to take it seriously."

Mr. Levine noted that there are enormous differences in values even among members of similar socioeconomic groups, due to differences in child rearing and incredible miscommunication at every level of society. Mr. Levine explained, "We are missing each others' signals. We don't speak the same language."

Competition for limited resources

All of the panelists agreed that competition for limited resources was a factor contributing to the increase in racial bigotry on campus. In the 1960s, Federal programs increased resources for programs to aid minority access to higher education. That is not happening now.

Mr. Cheng noted that the Federal Government's efforts under the Reagan administration to reduce or eliminate affirmative action programs have sent subtle messages to college students that it is okay to ignore past or present discrimination against minorities.

According to Ms. Flores-Hughes, interviews conducted by the Department of Justice's Community Relations Service's staff reveal that campus communities feel that the national and international causes of racial incidents include the increasing cost of college, the restructuring of Federal loans and grants, and the local impact of international issues. One of the international issues to receive a great deal of attention on American campuses, according to Dr. Balch, is apartheid in South Africa.

Competition for limited resources often originates with no racial conflict, according to Dr. Ross, but as the competition grows stronger, ethnic or racial differences may become an issue. As such conflicts become "ethnicized," he explained, they become much more dangerous.

According to Dr. Wilson, there are differences in terms of the perception of resources. "Many people on campuses, not only white students, but white faculty as well, perceive it as a zero

sum game. That is, if you get some, I lose some." The increasing numbers of minority students on campuses are seen as an encroachment on white entitlement, he said. Part of the resentment and hostility is due to that perception, according to Dr. Wilson.

Another cause is an ignorance of history, especially the history of race relations in the United States. Campus administrators do not help students understand that policies are intended to redress systemic discrimination that has existed since the Nation's founding. Faculty and administrators abet white students in perceiving distortions in the allocation of resources. They have no sense of why certain students arrive on campus through equal opportunity programs or with Pell grants.

Extremist speakers

Several of the panelists discussed the effect of extremist speakers. Dr. Ross proposed that the months of controversy leading up to the speech are more important than the speech itself. The "swirling" controversy tends to polarize people, he said, generating tensions on campus.

According to Dr. Ross, large numbers of incidents have resulted from extremist speakers, since many enjoy the use of a rent-free university lecture hall with an available audience. "If [an individual] speaks at the University of Pennsylvania, he is going to get much, much more attention than he will by renting a hall and giving a speech in inner-city Philadelphia or inner-city Chicago or inner city anyplace else. . . . It really ultimately doesn't matter whether they actually succeed or not in coming on to the campus. What is most important to them is that they get months and months and months of free publicity out of it."

Vice Chairman Friedman inquired about the influence of extremist speakers on race relations, particularly black-Jewish relations, on campuses. According to Dr. Ross, the reaction is the same on any campus visited by an extremist—the groups become polarized, especially the blacks and Jews.

Commissioner Guess followed up, wanting to know if the message given by extremist speakers had any effect on the students. Also, do the victimized end up serving as "marketing agents" because of the preperformance reaction that is generated?

Dr. Ross stated that the speech is often disappointing, but the controversy leading up to the speech has already succeeded in polarizing people on campus. "Those who perceive themselves being victimized by a monger of hate will react to it. By reacting to it, they are going to raise the heat, and when you have more heat you have more visibility if not more light."

Chapter 4

Recommended Solutions

Since the panelists did not present a single cause of the recent incidents of racial violence, they naturally did not present a single solution. The panelists' recommendations fell into four categories: 1) existing resources (both on and off campus); 2) multicultural training; 3) Federal support and involvement; and 4) the free speech dilemma.

Existing resources

Off-campus tools

According to Judith Kruger of the U.S. Department of Justice's Community Relations Service (CRS), the CRS regional offices take official notice that tension exists on particular campuses. Sometimes a conciliator contacts the institution, but often the institution contacts CRS first, she said. To assess an official notice of a tension, the regional office completes the following steps: determining the issues, the history of the issues, and who was involved (how and why); and determining the resources, the possibility of solution without outside intervention, and how local resources might be developed, Ms. Kruger said.

She said that each regional office offers three types of assistance in developing local resources: technical assistance, which includes background material from other similar situations; conciliation, or improved communication techniques to bring the parties together to talk, short of formal mediation; and formal mediation.

In the past, the CRS has provided the following assistance to college administrators and populations that might be helpful to others:

- assisted colleges in developing reporting mechanisms for racial and ethnic incidents on campus;
- assisted universities in reviewing their policies and other written statements addressing racial and ethnic diversity;
- conducted mediation training;
- conducted crisis mediation and conciliation between protestors and administrators, campus police, local or State police, and neighborhood groups;
- assisted schools in developing their own mediation services, ombudsperson offices, and resident assistants' training in dispute resolution;

- provided university communities with current information on hate violence;
- assisted towns or institutions in dealing with organized hate groups such as the Klan who express interest in organizing or other activities on the campus or in the town;
- encouraged universities to assess the propensity for racial and ethnic disturbances. CRS has developed a tool to aid administrators in assessing the racial and ethnic climate of the campus, which they will gladly provide;
- provided training on racial and ethnic sensitivity to campus law enforcement officers; and
- mediated disputes about university expansion and the institution's relationship with the neighborhood.

On-campus tools

During the briefing, several panelists noted methods of preventing and/or dealing with campus bigotry that were developed by colleges. These methods included minority representation, affirmative action programs, law enforcement, and student involvement.

In describing methods used on his university's campus to address and prevent conflicts among minority students, Dr. Dunham noted that Penn State, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the University of California-Berkeley are the top three research universities producing black undergraduates who eventually earn doctoral degrees in the sciences. (This information is based on statistics collected between 1980 and 1984 by the National Research Council.)

Dr. Dunham also noted that Penn State is the second most populated university by blacks of 109 4-year schools in Pennsylvania. From 1982 to 1988, minority enrollment at Penn State increased 79.3 percent, while the number of blacks graduating from high school in Pennsylvania decreased approximately 15 percent. During the 1988–89 academic year, more blacks and minorities attended Penn State than at any time in the university's history, with more blacks graduating in 1988 from Penn State than in any previous year.

Dr. Dunham stated that Penn State has a campus environment team, part of a model, to review systematically incidents reported and to assess the campus environment. He said that the team includes the vice president for administration, the vice president for student services, the vice president and vice provost, the affirmative action officer, the director of the black studies program, the chair of the equal opportunity planning committee, the director of the campus life assistance center, the director of public information, and the director of university safety.

Dr. Dunham explained that the team either visits student groups or invites students to discuss concerns, as appropriate. It addresses urgent concerns and ways to improve the environment and makes recommendations to the appropriate offices and in many cases directly to the office of the president. Many of the programs and activities recommended by the team were being initiated this past year.

According to Dr. Dunham, Penn State's model team is prepared to speak out strongly and quickly against acts of intolerance. He said that the university's president has strongly supported this role by making public pronouncements in newspaper ads, in letters to the editor, in radio and television spots, and in public forums. The president has also encouraged others to speak out, and other community leaders have also expressed their support.

Dr. Dunham stated that the model is also directed at taking action and planning programs to deal with racism and bigotry. In this vein, he said, a vice provost will be hired to oversee equal opportunity for underrepresented peoples, including women.

According to Dr. Dunham, Penn State also appointed a 25-member advisory commission on racial and ethnic diversity which reports to the president through the new vice provost. He said that a three-member team of social scientists is advising the model team on ways to improve the climate for minorities at Penn State.

By the president's direction, there will be minority representation on all of the administration's policymaking bodies, and many more cooperative efforts both on and off campus and between the two communities, according to Dr. Dunham.

Dr. Dunham said that the model also seeks to keep the channels of communication open both ways, including an 800-number hotline available to parents. Despite the model's best intentions, noted Dr. Dunham, "confrontation is not always avoided."

Dr. Wilson reminded those present that, although many denounce affirmative action, no one has offered a better method to achieve the same goal. Miami University of Ohio doubled its black faculty in just a little over one academic year. "It can happen and the sky does not fall," he noted.

Dr. Dunham quoted a report from Northern Illinois University which said that the "renewed trend towards intolerance must not be allowed to gain a foothold on college campuses. . . . Colleges and universities must take a much more active role in developing a climate for minority students' success. . . . "

Mr. Levine, quoting a report, stressed that clear policies on any acting out, any action of bigotry against any racial, ethnic, or religious group are needed, with serious and immediate punishment enforceable by law. He urged administrators to examine

student campus involvement, see if there are sufficient activities that are ethnically and religiously related, but also activities that provide common ground for all students. Faculty should review the courses and ensure there are sensitive instructors and professors, he said.

Dr. Ross suggested that institutions work from both below and above to sensitize faculty, students, and administrators to the consequences of their words and actions and to have administrators clearly state and enforce the institution's policies.

From the students' perspective, active involvement is a key. Patrick Cheng, the student panelist, was the first minority president in 102 years of Dwight Hall, the community service and volunteer activist center at Yale. He was also a member of Yale's ad hoc committee examining free expression policies on campus, which examined university regulations concerning conflict between controversial speakers and the limits of harassment. This committee included Yale professors, including several from the law school, he said.

Mr. Cheng also was a founding member of Campuses Against Racist Violence, a coalition of 40 colleges in the Northeast and East that tracks incidents of racist violence and shares information. The group holds conferences for schools to learn how to combat racist violence.

Reference materials

Several of the panelists referred to *One-Third of a Nation*, published by the National Commission on Minority Participation in Education, which discusses what the consequences of not dealing with minority education would be for the United States. Copies were distributed to all members of Congress, all college and university presidents, and to other organizations.

The American Council on Education issued *Minorities on Campus* in January 1989. It is a handbook of strategies designed to help institutions develop programs that will successfully recruit, retain, and maintain the minority presence on campus. Recommendations are based on actual campus programs that have proved successful in affirmative action.

Multicultural training

Dr. Dunham urged the Commission not to take as the rationale for diversity "bringing in minority students and making them white in 4 years."

Mr. Levine based his comments on his organization's experience on over 75 campuses, and his personal experience conducting multiethnic training over the last 10 years in high schools. He indicated that the American Jewish Committee (AJC) leads preju-

dice-reduction workshops with consultants all over the country, which have proven that there is "a base of good will among students, faculty, and administrators who want to carry on this program." However, in Mr. Levine's opinion, the workshops are inadequate in responding to the systemic problems that the AJC knows about. Mr. Levine said that the AJC is shifting toward "systemic institutional consultation," or helping universities carry out a total plan in dealing with issues of cultural pluralism.

According to Mr. Levine, "[t]here have been 20 years of ethnic advocacy. . . . Now, in addition to legitimate ethnic advocacy, we need to spend the next 5 years in upgrading the process of coalition-building and a return to intergroup relations. We need to systematize skills training in this field. And we need to transmit these skills to young people, and they will buy if we provide it."

Dr. Short questioned both sensitivity training in higher education and requiring all students to take minority studies. He objected to "fashioning the curriculum and student life" to mold attitudes. Rather, he supported free thought based on "knowledge, intellectual training, and free and open discussion of controversial issues."

Further, Dr. Short questioned if it is even possible to "mold attitudes in a classroom." Students will resent being "manipulated instead of being educated." Dr. Short favored courses in minority cultures that "need not have the specific aim of making students more tolerant. They can be just straightforward, good academic studies of their subjects without any ulterior motive." He opposed ethnic studies courses that are perverted by "those who wish to use them to change society and students' attitudes."

Dr. Short argued such courses will "create differences between whites and blacks where none exist and exaggerate the differences that do exist. . . .and it will reinforce the suspicion many black students unfortunately have that by succeeding in the standard curriculum they are somehow selling out to the white world."

He also said it is "ridiculous. . .to suppose that black Americans have more in common culturally with Africans than with their follow Americans. They share a society with the latter, not with the former."

"Barriers are not broken down by equating culture with color," Dr. Short explained, "but by working with people of other races on matters of mutual interest, on matters that transcend questions of race."

Dr. Short predicted that "multicultural education will be even less effective against real racism than against insensitivity."

In responding to a rebuttal about sensitivity training, Dr. Short explained that he was referring to multicultural education that is offered for college credit and required of all students. Although

he agreed that racial prejudice and the special problems of minorities are legitimate subjects of study, he also feared a backlash would occur if student life is organized around activities that emphasize their victimization.

Federal support and involvement

In response to Commissioner Buckley's request for suggestions on what the Commission could do to help alleviate the problem, all panelists agreed that the Commission's first job was to decide what the problem is. If the Commission chooses to focus on campus racial problems, Dr. Wilson noted, it should "establish some kind of model program that it can advise institutions they might undertake." Dr. Wilson urged the Commission to not just deal with symptoms, but get to the systemic problems and to take a "proactive stand on civil rights."

"We are suggesting," said Dr. Wilson, "that not only should we be working on eliminating these problems [minority grievances] in the 21st century, but we ought to do something about them now."

To prevent more incidents from occurring, Mr. Cheng said the Federal Government (especially the Executive Branch) should take an active and visible role in saying that racist violence is unacceptable, that college administrators should publicly condemn this behavior strongly as soon as it occurs. More minorities should be involved in policymaking on the level of university administrations to contribute to more effective operations.

After incidents occur, Mr. Cheng suggested that colleges that do not act against racist violence should lose Federal funding. Mr. Cheng said that Congress should look at schools with long histories of racist behavior. Mr. Cheng, however, was against banning controversial speakers or tightening the definition of harassment.

Mr. Cheng reminded the Commission that students, as a transient population, cannot be expected to handle a problem like racist violence alone. They do not have access to the kind of financial and communications resources available to government agencies, he said.

Dr. Dunham recommended strong, clear signals from the Federal Government and increased availability of more financial aid for needy students.

Mr. Cheng also emphasized the importance of students being educated about the proper channels for addressing incidents of racial unrest and/or violence.

The free speech dilemma

In discussing solutions to visits by extremist speakers and other first amendment rights that affect resolving campus bigotry and violence, the panelists addressed the dilemma of balancing free speech on campus with the quest for an absence of campus tension. In regard to extremist speakers, Dr. Ross said that the appearances would be less likely to cause problems if they fell more into the category of "opportunities for academic exchange of views, and less in the way of public rallies." Dr. Ross pointed out the interchange between campus tension and community tension and how the two build and feed on each other.

Ms. Kruger said that the first amendment right to free speech is being examined by campus administrators and student populations in regard to speech that results in physical injury, harassment, or intimidation. She said that the Department of Justice's Community Relations Service facilitates opportunities for college presidents and others to explore finding ways to balance protection against racial harassment and protection of free speech.[6]

Dr. Balch contended that the Commission should address incidents that "in any environment would be considered. . . criminal. . .acts of personal injury, acts of vandalism and destruction of property, particularly where there is some kind of group hatred behind them, and also cases of clear discourtesy." Dr. Balch warned about balancing respect for civility with avoiding suppression or intimidation of people "who had views that were either opprobrious to many or in some cases just opprobrious to a few." He encouraged a distinction between insults and the expression of "ideas that some people didn't like."

---

[6] Judith Kruger, USCCR Briefing.

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Murray Friedman, and I am the Vice Chairman of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission I would like to introduce to you the fellow members of the Commission who are here with us today to hear the testimony that will be given to us.

On my right, but only geographically, not ideologically or philosophically, is Esther Buckley, a member of the Civil Rights Commission, who is from Texas.

On my left is Melvin Jenkins, who is the Acting Director of the Commission.

On his left is Commissioner Sherwin Chan of California.

To his left is Francis Guess, a distinguished member of the Commission, from Tennessee.

Thank you for coming here and thank you, members of the group who are in front of us, for joining us today to give advice and counsel to our work.

As some of you may know, I have been particularly concerned about the apparent increase in the number of incidents of bigotry and violence on college campuses. Last summer introduced a resolution calling on staff to prepare for us a briefing on the subject. The written document that staff produced and which all of you were sent pointed the way for further study.

Again, I introduced a resolution in March of this year to hold a formal briefing for the Commissioners. In April we decided that a more fruitful discussion could occur if more participants were invited, and the Chairman established this subcommittee to expand the briefing in a half-day session today.

That was three weeks ago. I want to both thank and compliment the staff, Melvin Jenkins and John Eastman, for pulling together an extraordinary amount of useful material and developing this briefing on very short notice. It is difficult to bring people in from various parts of the country in a short period of time, and this is exactly what the staff has done and they have done a bang-up job.

I ought to also point out that we have attempted very seriously to bring in a variety don't mean those who are for or against violence. I mean those who have different perspectives as to the nature of the origin of harassment and violence and what it all means.

I have here a bundle of material reflecting some of the news clippings that the staff has gathered. Most of this bundle is made up of news clippings. It is really quite extraordinary both in terms of heft and the number of indications of various examples of racial and religious harassment, intimidation, and violence that has been developing. I believe this body of material reflects a

bundle that was collected and is not quite brought up to date. This is what I received six or seven weeks ago from the staff.

The problem is that we really don't know what this all means. We have a body of anecdotal material. The newspapers tell us this is what has happened. It is difficult to put this in any perspective, to understand what it means, and of course, most importantly, to be able to think through ways of dealing with issues of this kind. It is for that reason that we have gathered together.

The Commission is not an enforcement agency. We are not here to resolve existing tensions on any particular campus, nor are we here to fix blame on any particular individuals. We are here to assess what is happening at our institutions of higher learning and we are here to see if perhaps our collective wisdom can contribute to a solution of the problem.

We will be publishing a transcript of these discussions, a document reflecting the viewpoints that are expressed here, and other materials that we have gathered, and perhaps most importantly, will make some recommendations as to what should be done.

Before we begin, I have been cautioned to urge on you certain cautionary comments. Statements that would tend to defame or degrade particular individuals should be avoided. In addition, we have much to discuss this afternoon, so please try to limit your initial presentation to ten minutes. My colleagues, please try to limit your questions immediately following each presentation to those of a clarifying nature. More substantive comments and questions are more suited for the roundtable discussion portion of the agenda.

With those brief and introductory comments, we can go directly to the testimony that you are here to make. We have divided it generally into three categories.

The first session will be given over to trying to measure the extent of the problem.

The second session will direct itself toward those individuals here who are expert in the area of helping us try to understand the causes of the problem.

The third session will be given over to something here that is called solutions. We may interrupt that by virtue of some of the difficult schedules that one or two of you have, but it will be within that order that we will be going.

I am going to call on Grace Flores-Hughes first, who carries the title of Director, Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Welcome, Ms. Hughes. You have ten minutes.

STATEMENT OF MS. GRACE FLORES-HUGHES

MS. FLORES-HUGHES: We at the Justice Department Community Relations have dealt with each of the three different areas you will be discussing, the extent of the problem, causes, and solutions.

I would like to give my presentation for about two or three minutes and then Judy Kruger, who is a field staff person who deals with this situation first hand, will give you a little bit about the causes and the solutions that we have been working on at Community Relations. I have to leave but she will stay here for the roundtable discussion. Some of the solutions and causes that you will be discussing later on, she can, I am sure, provide some input, given her firsthand knowledge and experience with the situation.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: May I have her name again?

MS. FLORES-HUGHES: Judy Kruger. She is one of my conciliators from the field, and in this particular case, from Philadelphia. She has done a lot of work on campuses and a lot of specific work on it, so she will be

MS. FLORES-HUGHES: Judy Kruger. She is one of my conciliators from the field, and in this particular case, from Philadelphia. She has done a lot of work on campuses and a lot of specific work on it, so she will be ny national data. Data, as many of you know, is lacking. We collected only based on the alerts that we do at the Community Relations Service. So I do want to specify that what I am about to talk to you all about is based on our experience in the field and the alerts that we receive.

Since 1986 CRS's case work involving college campuses has increased significantly. For example, in 1987 CRS field staff filed 48 alerts involving campuses. In 1988 the field staff filed 77 alerts. For those of you who may not be familiar, an alert is a formal notification from the field to the headquarters office that racial tensions exist at a particular site. It is a formal notification.

As I said, there is a lack of accurate statistics on the number of racial incidents that have occurred on campuses.

Based on interviews we have had with students and other members affected, what we have found is that national and international causes include the increasing cost of college, the restructuring, for example, of federal loans and grants; many college officials' fear of minority activism caused by sympathy for international issues.

We break them up by national and local.

On the local campus level, many of these causes include perceived hostile campus environments, isolation of many minorities on college campuses, perceived issues of recruitment and

retention of minority students and faculty, and perceptions of curriculum not inclusive of minority cultures.

Defunding or de-emphasis of special programs that target minorities is another example.

Perceived institutional discouragement from entering or continuing academic studies in certain disciplines of minority students.

Those are some examples of what the students have told our conciliators, our field staff.

Our special interest is the lack of dispute resolution mechanisms available in colleges and universities and perceptions that existing mechanisms are unfair. So while we are worried about what exists, another comment that has been brought up is the perception that those mechanisms may not be really helping the students.

Again I emphasize that this is based on my staff doing their field work and their interviews with college officials and students.

Let me hand it over to Judy Kruger and let her tell you some of the things that we are doing at the Community Relations.

STATEMENT OF MS. JUDITH KRUGER

MS. KRUGER: Thank you.

I am a conciliation specialist at Community Relations Service. I am based in Region III, which is Philadelphia. We have ten offices around the country, so we have been involved in campuses all across the country.

I would like to focus on pragmatic responses to campus racial and ethnic tension that our agency has been involved with.

First, I want to tell you very, very briefly how we work.

As was mentioned, we first take official notice that there is a tension. We work voluntarily. We may contact the institution. Often the institution has contacted us first. We go through a process of assessment to determine what the issues are, what the history of the issues are, who was involved, how, why, what the resources are, how good the chances of solution without any outside intervention are, and how local resources could be developed.

If we have a sense that we could be useful in developing local resources, we could offer three types of assistance.

The first is technical assistance. That may mean a college president calling me and saying would you please put together a packet of statutes from states on reporting racial and ethnic incidents so that I can adopt them for a university setting.

The second level of assistance is conciliation. Conciliation is any process that improves communication, that brings parties together to talk short of formal mediation. The result of conciliation is improved communication between different groups.

Our third resource is formal mediation. We are all trained formal mediators.

We frequently are invited in during a particular tension or an incident. We offer assistance in the immediate improvement of communication and dispute resolution channels, and frequently we develop an ongoing relationship due to the effectiveness of the initial response.

The types of responses that we have provided over the past two or three years which I think would be of general use to college administrators, in fact all college populations, are:

- assisting colleges in developing reporting mechanisms for racial and ethnic incidents on campus.
- assisting universities to review their policies and other written statements impacting on racial and ethnic diversity.

We have conducted mediation training; we have conducted crisis mediation and conciliation between protestors and administrators, campus police, local or state police, and neighborhood groups.

We have assisted schools in the development of their own mediation services, ombudsperson offices, resident assistant training in dispute resolution.

We have provided university communities with up-to-date information on hate violence. We have had a number of schools in the past couple of years where there have been approaches by organized hate groups such as the Klan to the university or to a university town. We have worked with the town or the institution in dealing with those approaches.

We have encouraged universities to assess their racial and ethnic climate. Often we find there is a perception gap between groups. For example, administrators will say people are very comfortable here; everyone seems comfortable. We find in assessing the views of discrete groups that there may be discomforts that administrators are not aware of which lead to incidents that they need to become aware of on an ongoing basis.

To this end, we have developed a tool to aid administrators in assessing the racial and ethnic climate of the campus. We would be happy to provide that tool. You can contact me later.

We have provided training to campus law enforcement officers on racial and ethnic awareness. We have helped them examine their hiring and promotion policies within the department, helped them look at improving their relationship with on-campus and off-campus populations. To this end, I will be working with the Virginia campus law enforcement administrators in June, giving them two workshops.

We have mediated disputes about university expansion and the institution's relationship with the neighborhood.

I think I will stop there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

We will first have the testimony and then we will have questions and discussion.

Incidentally, I am not going to go through the entire biographical sketch describing your virtues, accomplishment and achievements. We will stipulate that you all are virtuous, achieving, and more than competent with regard to these and many other matters.

The next panelist is Jeffrey Ross, who is from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. His role will be to describe the number and character of incidents occurring. I have asked Mr. Ross to broaden the scope of his examination of these materials in terms of outside agitators and individuals often seen connected with hate groups who have been coming to campus.

Dr. Ross.

STATEMENT OF DR. JEFFREY ROSS

Dr. ROSS: At the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith we have for some time now been looking at cases of anti-Semitism on campus. What we have seen for at least the last five years has been basically a steady increase.

In calendar year 1988 we saw a process going from one of a more or less steady increase to one of a dramatic increase. We saw a 271 percent increase in the number of campuses reporting incidents to a total of 38 campuses reporting incidents in 1988.

It always has to be kept in mind that the nature of processes on campuses, especially if one goes to small liberal arts institutions which are not close to any major media center, that you have a systematic process in which reporting of incidents tends to be distorted downward. Therefore, whatever we see inevitably tends to be the tip of the iceberg.

If one takes the 170 incidents which the Civil Rights Commission compiled as something of a baseline, then what you have for 1988, if I read the data correctly, is a situation in which 22.3 percent of all the incidents on campuses as we see them involved one way or another cases of anti-Semitism.

What I would like to do is address myself to a variety of issues which are both explanatory and also to get to the issue that Mr. Friedman suggests, which I think is an important one. But what I would like to do is to go beyond the materials which I have provided in the briefing paper which you have before you.

The first thing I would like to point out is that an attack on one minority will inevitably lead to a circumstance in which other minorities become vulnerable, and therefore it is no accident that the increased levels of anti-Semitism on campus are directly related to and exist in a climate of increasing numbers of instances of racial and ethnic bigotry and prejudice on campus.

The question inevitably arises, are there more cases or are we just finding more cases because we are looking for them? That, I think, is an essential question to which a definitive answer at the moment is not available. It is my feeling, being someone who has worked in this area, that the answer is both. There are more cases but we have also been finding more cases in part because there is greater attention being given to this subject and victims are more likely to come out and speak up. Not in all cases, but in many.

The inevitable next question is, what has there been about the last few years which has been conducive to this outcome? If there indeed has been more now, or at least if people are more sensitive to them now, or if our sense of fairness has been more antagonized by what has happened now, why has that been?

I would suggest a variety of explanations. This is a pattern of phenomena in which no one explanation will suffice, but let me give several, starting with one.

What you see in recent years is the development on a number of campuses of a critical mass of students from a variety of minority groups. There has been some data recently to suggest that black enrollments have actually gone down if not peaked.

Nonetheless, once you develop critical masses of minority students on campuses, one is more likely to get incidents than in situations where you do not have a presence of minorities on campus, and it has to be pointed out that the presence of large numbers of minorities on campus is a relatively recent phenomenon. Take Jews, for example, who right now have almost a universal higher education access. This is very much a post-World War II phenomenon. Before the second world war this did not happen. This has happened much more recently for other groups.

In the immediate generation of students from a minority group who first go to campuses in which they are in effect blazing new trails what is likely to happen is that they will in effect bury themselves into the campus and see a college education as a ticket to the American dream, as most indeed still do.

Nonetheless, after a generation or two of students, what you see is that students come to campus and are not satisfied only to achieve an education and to achieve the credentials for success in American life.

What they want to do on campus is to see the campus as an environment in which one can engage in personal and group self-actualization. What this is going to mean on campuses is that minority groups make demands for the allocation of scarce resources.

When this happens, what is inevitable is that there will be conflict, and to the degree to which demands are made for

financial aid changes, for changes of admissions policies, for changes in curricula structure, and so forth, you are having a situation in which existing resource allocation patterns are being challenged and also to a certain degree existing value structures are being challenged, and what you have inevitably will be conflict.

That is one level of explanation. There are others as well. I don't mean to suggest that this is anything near the total explanation. To be a social scientist for a moment, if it can incorporate 20 percent of the variation, I think that is a great deal.

Let me give you some other observations.

The first is that what you have on campus for many of the incidents are instances of related pathologies. Specifically, many of the instances that you see on campus, many of the most egregious instances on campus, involve other pathologies which have existed for quite some time. These include drug abuse on campus, in particular alcohol abuse on campus, vandalism on campus.

To a certain degree, these phenomena which have existed for some time and which will most likely continue to exist find specific minority targets. In looking at the impact upon minorities, one has to look at a background in which you have had alcohol abuse, and so forth and so on, on campus.

Another instance is that many of the cases that you see on campus occur and their origins are not out of deliberate bias or they are not initially about racial, ethnic or religious hatred. One of the things you have to remember about a campus is that it is an environment in which people are brought together in relatively close quarters.

Often what happens is that individuals will get involved in conflict over relatively modest things: a place in line, access to a book in the library, access to a closed course, or whatever. In a situation of conflict between two individuals, if there are ethnic, racial or religious differences, what will happen in a certain proportion of cases is that these conflicts which are not about ethnic, racial or religious things will become ethnicized, and when they become ethnicized they become much more dangerous and they become something other than what they originally were.

Another point is that many of the problems that you see on campus occur not from deliberate bias, but occur as well because of ignorance, occur also because of insensitivity.

Let me point out that many, many people in our society live in communities in which their degree of systematic interaction with others is highly limited. They go to a college campus. The classic student is 17 or 18 years old. For the first time in their lives many of them are away from home. This can be an

academically difficult time for them; it can be a personally difficult time for them; it can be a sexually difficult time, and so forth and so on. Now in the midst of all this they have to deal, quite often on an everyday basis, with people from other groups that they have never had an experience of dealing with in the past.

This can create an environment of incidents; it can also create an environment of rampant insensitivity. I think it is clear to point out that people who are 17 or 18 years old are basically not those who are best known for being sensitive in intergroup situations.

We generally tend to look at incidents on campus as invariably being majority versus minority. Whereas there are a great number of those, we also have to be aware that there are many, many cases which involve minority-minority conflict.

In addition, a dynamic force in much conflict on campus involves intragroup conflict, which then gives rise to intergroup conflict.

Many campus administrations err because they perceive these problems as fundamentally public relations problems rather than as human relations problems. I think a key to the solution is that institutions need to perceive their problems as being fundamentally human relations rather than as public relations.

The question that Mr. Friedman has asked involves extremist speakers. The extremist speaker who has received the greatest attention, including the greatest attention from us, is [name deleted]. But he is not alone. Others include [name deleted], otherwise known as [name deleted], and even the now fired aide of former Mayor Sawyer of Chicago [name deleted] has been hitting the campus circuit.

What we tend to do in looking at these instances is to focus on the speech itself as the incident and specifically see what degree of poison the speaker has spread on campus.

I would submit that the speech itself, although it is important, is not the most important thing. What is most important is that you have months and months of controversy quite often swirling around up to the date of the speech and what this controversy tends to do is polarize people, to generate tensions on campus.

Campuses should be seen as communities. When you have polarization and tension in a community the bonds of community break down and people tend to see each other not as fellow members of the community or even as individuals, but as members of contending groups.

So when you have cases of not only extremist speakers, but Klan groups and others who try to achieve access on campus, you have also situations like the one at Temple University where a white student union has been chartered, in which you have student groups in formation. These sorts of situations polarize

students who are not personally involved in the issue. It creates tension and this tension will exist and persist quite often for years afterwards even after the speaker has long since gone and what he has exactly said has long been forgotten.

The implications of these things are great, and I think by concentrating only on the speech itself we tend to lose sight of the larger issues.

To conclude, in terms of what do we do, there are many things that can be done.

I think two things need to be pointed out.

Number one, you have to work from both below and above. From below one has to be in a situation working to sensitize people on campus, faculty, students, administrators, to the reality that words have consequences, deeds have consequences, and that when you do certain things other people will be adversely affected and one should be aware of that. Quite often what you are dealing with is a situation in which people are not consciously seeking to antagonize others but are going along with a campus environment, a campus culture which breeds intolerance, which breeds bigotry, and one has to try to intervene to in effect break that culture or at least confront it.

The second thing, and most important, one has to deal with administrators from above. Administrators are those who set the moral tone on campus. It is crucial that administrators specifically state through policy this is what will be accepted on campus, this is what will not be accepted on campus. The rules have to be clear and the rules have to be clearly applied and be seen to be clearly applied.

Let me stop there.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Dr. Ross. I found your comments particularly helpful by putting the incidents in a broader context as well as the number and amount of episodes.

Our next speaker is Dr. Stephen Balch, who is the chairman of the National Association of Scholars, a fairly recently formed organization, and, I might add, a personal friend as well.

STATEMENT OF DR. STEPHEN BALCH

DR. BALCH: Thank you, Murray.

I am going to speak at the outset from the vantage of my faculty role, drawing whatever insights I can. I have for 14 years been associate professor of government at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Though it is not directly my field, this has given me a little bit of knowledge about the problems inherent in collecting figures about crime incidents, some of which have already been touched on by Dr. Ross; also a vantage on the inner life of an institution with a very heterogeneous ethnic and racial composition located in Manhattan.

With respect to the collection of figures having to do with crime, of course most criminal acts are in some sense harder. They refer to activities in which, in the most extreme sense, there may be a body, in the case of a murder; in which there is property damage or theft or something of that sort. These have long been known to be very much a function (a) of people's willingness to report the alleged offense, with the exception of murder where in fact you have usually indisputable evidence of a crime, and (b) the willingness of those agencies that collect statistics to report the statistics and to publicize them.

In the state of New Jersey, where I serve as chair of the New Jersey State Advisory Committee, one of the things we recently did was to encourage the state of New Jersey to systematically collect statistics on incidents having to do with hate crimes. This will seem to show, I am sure, that there has been a rise in hate crimes in the state of New Jersey. We have statistics on it now; we didn't have statistics on it seven or eight years ago. That may indeed have happened, but there is an appearance apart from the reality that has to be taken into account.

In terms of my personal experience at John Jay, and I have been there now since 1974, I don't think it is a particularly unusual institution given its geographic situation. There has always been a strong undercurrent of tension between students of different backgrounds.

We have many different populations represented in the student body. Many of the students get along very well, and of course it is always terribly encouraging to see that. There are many interracial and ethnic friendships which develop on campus.

One of the best parts of being at a place like John Jay is to see that kind of thing occur. Of course for most of the students at the college it is a place to go and to take their course and to get a degree and they are probably more or less indifferent to the great body of other students.

But, throughout my experience there, there have always been incidents: a nasty word said; allegations of discrimination in the distribution of student funds, for example; even things which happened in classrooms, with which I have direct experience; comments made by students in class. Many of these episodes have been uncomfortabe either personally or to hear about.

Nonetheless, it is not simply a matter of recent history. It is a matter of very long duration. If you go into any of the restrooms at the college, there has always been a profuse supply of racist graffiti on the walls, in the toilet stalls. They are updated. They are washed off the walls and they appear again. There are dialogues that take place among the graffiti writers. It is a very lively, unpleasant aspect to have to bear witness to, but it is nothing new. It has been there a long, long time.

Now it may indeed be the case that these kinds of incidents are increasing. I think we have to be cautious in drawing those conclusions, but it may indeed be true. I think we have to kind of take these limitations on our perceptions of the situation into account. They are functions of things that are apart from the actual incidents that may be occurring.

In examining the possibility that there has indeed been a real increase and in looking at the period of time over which this increase has been reported, there do seem, to me at least, to be some climatic factors which may indirectly account for it. Some of these have been addressed by the presentation just preceding.

One that I would like to take into account occurred in 1984, 1985, 1986, and that was the fairly massive campaign on many campuses around the country to require institutions to divest themselves of holdings in companies that did business in South Africa.

Clearly, these are not racist incidents, but one could certainly argue plausibly that they had an effect of sharpening people's perceptions of their own identity as a member of this organized group, and also sharpen people's perceptions of the salience of racial issues, both in American society, and maybe more importantly, on campus, because after all, the chief allegation that was made was that the colleges and universities were in a state of complicity with racist policies abroad. It was really brought right down to the level of the institution itself.

One really can't plot out all the sequences and relationship of causation, but here you have something that did occur right at the beginning of the period that we are addressing ourselves to. Certainly it is not farfetched to imagine that it brought the issue of racism in a variety of ways much more squarely to the campus than anything had before. Again, if people's perceptions have a lot to do with how they interpret specific things that happen in their day-to-day life, it is conceivable that this campaign was sort of a watershed.

Another thing one might say is that we have increasingly widened our notion of what harassment and victimization constitutes because during the late 1970s and 1980s we have multiplied the number of groups and the types of acts that we consider to be offensive.

I am not talking about racial incidents particularly here, because I don't think there has been a change on that score, but with respect to harassment on the basis of sex. I travel around the country and go to a lot of colleges and universities. I was absolutely stopped in my tracks when I saw on the wall of a professor's office what could have been — I don't know if it was or not — a cartoon out of Playboy. He had it up on his wall.

I could not imagine most professors, whatever their personal feelings were, with any mind for their futures and careers doing that. I don't know what this man's position was, but ten or 15 years ago I think the attitude would have been quite different.

Clearly there has been a change of sensibility on this matter and whatever one might think of all of its manifestations, it changes the way in which people perceive individual acts.

The same thing is true when it comes to cases of sexual harassment based on what we now say is sexual preference. Again, people look at these acts differently. There are also groups on campus that are willing to make a case against certain forms of behavior that in the past would have been maybe just seen as tasteless but not seen as specific effects. That too has to be taken into account.

I have some other things to say about the causes of the problem. I am not sure I fall into that category, so I will just limit it to maybe a minute and a half and perhaps I can come back to it later.

Campuses are unique places when we are talking about issues of group tension and perceived discrimination and unfairness. They are unique places in American society because they are not just places where people work together, and students, of course, do work together to some extent. They are places where people work and live together, and yet strangely enough, they are also not permanent communities. They are communities where people stay for a while and move on.

I urge that last point as being of some importance, because if you work and live together and you expect you are going to do it for a very long time, you have an incentive to get along with people who you are with, whatever you may feel or think. On the other hand, if you are going to move on, it is not all that critical.

So you have people at very close quarters with each other who do not have any real necessity to like each other, to form enduring bonds. You also have people at a time in the upside of their lives, the free spirits of youth; the down side, of course, is that their passions are less governable. They sort of give way to things that adults would be able to contain.

All this is taking place in a situation in which for some time and increasingly you have a two-tier structure of education, particularly as it affects racial and ethnic minorities. You have increasingly, though it has been around for some time, differential standards as applied to admissions. If you look at the Madison plan as an example, which was part of the documents we were given in preparation for this, as applied to financial aid; as applied to counseling; as applied to a whole series of things which affect group success.

Again, what everyone might think of the merits of doing this along racial and ethnic lines, and I have some real reservations about it, when you are dealing with a student body that has all these other characteristics, which to some degree is competing individually for grades and for positions and for entry, it is not surprising that some students will perhaps take offense. Whatever the merit of their feeling about the general policy, oftentimes this would be expressed in offensive and abusive actions towards individuals in groups to which their resentments may be developing.

So I think if we want to look at the roots, we might want to examine how these policies operate and the kinds of perceptions that students have on both sides about the fairness and equity of these policies.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Dr. Balch, and thank you, members of the panel who have shared your thoughts with us.

We come now to that portion of this program in which the Commissioners may address questions to the panel, or to comment or exchange. We will permit about ten or 15 minutes on this.

Esther.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY: First of all, I want to thank you for being here this afternoon. We are truly concerned about what is happening and we appreciate that you have given us the time to be here.

The work that the Department of Justice has done in their CRS division is quite impressive. You have covered all three areas, so it is going to be hard to just take "the extent of the problem." So I am going to have to overlap.

You say that whenever you have a situation some of the characteristics that you see that lead to the increases in campus tension are financial. You say tuition has increased dramatically and rapidly and grant and loan availability and qualifications have changed.

I would ask all three of you. Why is it that we see it from 1987 to 1988? Why wasn't it there before? It seems like all of a sudden there is a big jump. What would you say is the one cause or the one factor that is the straw that broke the camel's back? What happened in 1987 that made the difference in 1988?

I recognize that availability of monies was one of the issues, but why the changes? Did it just kind of explode at that point?

DR. BALCH: One of my contentions was that perhaps in the years preceding there were some other changes which sharpened people's sensitivities on these scores. Once a certain threshold is passed and the issue becomes picked up by the national press, then the incentive system to report incidents that might have

gone unreported changes. The interest of reporters is enhanced. Those students who for whatever reason feel that it will be better for them or for their group to talk about the incidents, their incentive to report it increases.

You also have these issues increasingly tied up with efforts to change the way in which institutions are governed, recruitment processes, curriculum structure

Groups that feel they have an interest — sometimes these are actually people within the highest level of the administration of the university or college itself — will also take the issue as an illustration of a problem that needs to be addressed in a way that they would like to address it: changing the content of the curriculum; hiring more faculty with certain backgrounds; admitting more students; establishing special counseling services. The issue has become part of a kind of political process within our nation's colleges and universities. As an issue does so, inevitably people not only become more aware of it, but become more willing to talk about it.

To some extent, there may also be a self-fulfilling prophecy aspect. The more people sense that there is racial tension the more racial tension actually exists, and so things happen that might not otherwise have happened. If I had to guess, and that is the best one can do, I would see it in that constellation of events and circumstances.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY: It just keeps going like a snowball?

DR. BALCH: It doesn't keep going forever. These processes generally are self-limiting. Perhaps there are things that we can do about it. But within certain limits a momentum tends to develop, yes.

Dr. ROSS: If I could add several observations to this. It may well be the fact that there is more attention being given to this. Clearly there has been attention given to this by the press, but there has always been attention given to this which was not given before by campus administrations.

The fact that now campus administrations are trying to confront the problems with all the noise and everything that comes along with that can be seen to a certain degree as an indication not only that there is a problem, but also an indication that there are at least attempts at a solution to the problem.

Going back to your question itself, there have been a number of egregious incidents which took place before 1988. Among these have been incidents in 1986. For instance, the infamous case of the hazing of the black cadet at the Citadel took place in 1986. The attack of a group of white Boston fans upon blacks who were perceived as being Mets fans at the University of Massachusetts

also took place in 1986. The major events at the University of Michigan in terms of the anti-black jokes on the radio station and all that emerged from that, sit-ins and so forth, took place before 1987.

If you look at it, one can see an acceleration perhaps of trends which have been going about for some time.

Also, I would like to point out that I think we go astray when we look at incidents and that the focus of our attention is upon the incident. In many situations what you have are conditions.

Take the case of the graffiti, for instance. If we have a situation where you have in effect a large graffiti on a public building, we consider that to be an incident. But if you have a large accumulation of small graffiti in what is otherwise a public place, a public bathroom, a library, and so forth, it just grows and it gathers over the years. Is that an incident? Every time somebody writes down a graffito, is that an incident? No, it's not. It becomes a condition.

For instance, date rape. Is that an incident or is that a condition? Problems that you have in terms of fraternity hazing, and so forth. Are those incidents or are those part of larger conditions?

I think if we look at the larger systems on and off campuses, I think we have a better view of these things than concentrating on incidents per se. When we concentrate on incidents we tend to see them as aberrations rather than as part and parcel of an ongoing culture.

I think to a certain degree what we have had this last year is a massive pothole on campus. Potholes are a phenomenon which one day you don't see and the next day you come out and there is a big hole in the ground. The question can be, well, what happened yesterday to create the hole in the ground? The hole in the ground wasn't created yesterday. It only appeared today. What you have had for years and years is subsurface erosion. I think that is really what we have been seeing.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Let's go around the room.

Commissioner Chan, do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER CHAN: I think we all agree that the majority of these problems on campus are due to drugs or alcohol, like Dr. Ross said. Or race or anti-Semitism. To me it is a reflection of the society. They are a group of people who are about to enter the real world. They are about to enter the society. When they see something, they are very sensitive and they react to it.

Dr. ROSS: I think what has happened on campus in the last few years is that people are reacting to things that previously they didn't react to. I think to a certain degree victims are having louder voices.

One more thing I would like to point out as well is that we have attention to the concern that a certain number of incidents on campus is a reaction to at least the perception of affirmative action policies. I think there is some truth in that.

It also has to be pointed out that a good deal of what you have in society and on campus as well in terms of incidents of hatred is not hatred directed against those who one has perceived as doing poorly, but rather you have instances which are exacerbated when people are perceived as doing well.

In particular, the large numbers of recent attacks upon Asians on campus has to be seen in this light. It is, I think, to our shame that institutions seem to be abetting this by their almost public concern over the fact that there are too many Asians entering public institutions. I think what this does is send signals to others to vent their hatreds. This goes back to what I said before. It is up to administrators to set the moral tone on campus. When administrators fail on this, what you have in effect is an amoral if not immoral tone set on campus.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Does anyone else want to comment on this?

(No response.)

Commissioner Guess.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: No questions.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I would like to ask a question. I live in Philadelphia. We have been experiencing a series of visits from [name deleted] to the campus of the University of Pennsylvania. I think beginning around October of 1986 each year he or a member of his staff returns to the campus. Each year there has been an enormous brouhaha that develops between the Jewish and the black students.

I want to get a sense from any of you, particularly Dr. Ross, whose agency monitors matters of this kind, as to the extent of such visits. I derive the impression from the newspapers that a considerable number of campuses have experienced this black-Jewish confrontation growing out of [name deleted]'s visits. What are its implications?

Dr. ROSS: I tried to discuss this before. What this does is polarize groups on campus. In particular it polarizes blacks and Jews on campus. This ties into other things which are happening on campus in terms of relations between blacks and Jews, things related to the Jesse Jackson campaign, especially in the last year, which has generated tensions, and also tensions relating to the fact that at least a portion of black activists on campus have taken up the Palestinian cause as a cause which they see as something akin to their own. If you add these things together, what you have are clearly exacerbating tensions.

In terms of numbers, you have large numbers. A very disturbing reality has come about now. You have extremist speakers. What extremist speakers want to do is to get publicity and to get an audience.

There are two ways to do it. One way to do it is to go to various places and rent a hall and hold a meeting.

But there is a better way. What they can do is get themselves invited to campuses where they don't have to rent the hall. They are also not only provided with a forum, but they are quite often paid very excellent speaking fees in order to do it.

What you have now is a situation in which a number of extremist groups have found in the campus a way of most effectively disseminating one's message into the society and maintaining one's notoriety.

The fact is that if [name deleted] speaks at the University of Pennsylvania, he is going to get much, much more attention than he will by renting a hall and giving a speech in inner city Philadelphia or inner city Chicago or inner city anyplace else.

You see other groups getting in on the bandwagon. You see in a number of states KKK groups petitioning to come on campus. By the way, it really ultimately doesn't matter whether they actually succeed or not in coming on to the campus. What is most important to them is that they get months and months and months of free publicity out of it. One is always reminded of the old truism of the Hollywood starlet: there is no such thing as bad publicity.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Commissioner Guess.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Has anyone conducted any post-[name deleted] visit assessment to determine what impact his message has on the students?

Dr. ROSS: I would argue that the message isn't the message. In a number of instances the speech itself turns out to be much more mild than people had been led to expect. [name deleted]'s most egregious comments are now well known. Before the speech these things are preprinted and discussed endlessly on the campus. The fact is that the real speech itself is generally anticlimactic. He or the others are not going to say anything that people haven't already read or seen on video tape or imagined in their own minds. To a certain degree these things tend to be disappointing. The problem is that the controversy leading up to the speech polarizes people on campus. Fairly or unfairly, you have that polarization and the polarization continues thereafter.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Are you suggesting then that Jewish Americans are the ones who in fact serve as [name deleted]'s marketing agents because of the pre-performance reaction that is generated?

Dr. ROSS: In just the same way that black Americans serve as KKK marketing agents, and so forth and so on. Those who perceive themselves being victimized by a monger of hate will react to it. By reacting to it they are going to raise the heat, and when you have more heat you have more visibility if not more light.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Are you suggesting that one way we may be able to nip this in the bud is to deal with the reactors?

Dr. ROSS: I think there are ways of dealing with this. This gets to the next point when you talk about extremist speakers on campus. Campus administrations are in a dilemma. The universities don't invite [name deleted]. It is student groups on the campuses who invite [name deleted]. The universities find themselves very uncomfortably in the middle. On the one hand, they would like to dump a problem that they didn't originate. At the University of Pennsylvania they were able to sidestep the issue through the question of a security bond.

On the other hand, there is an academic commitment to free speech. The question then becomes, how do you balance the two? I would argue that if the appearances on campus became more of what they are advertised as being, which is opportunities for academic exchange of views, and less in the way of public rallies, then perhaps we would go some way toward ameliorating the circumstance.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Did you want to comment, Ms. Kruger?

MS. KRUGER: Yes. I would like to add to that point that the First Amendment right to free speech is very, very much being examined. I think there are many people who have a strong feeling that the legal standard allows for the type of speech that results in physical injury, harassment, intimidation. I wanted to say that the Community Relations Service will be rescheduling to the fall a forum for college presidents to be discussing issues as difficult as free speech versus its possible results.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Examined by whom, please, Ms. Kruger?

MS. KRUGER: By many members of campus populations. I have seen it in student newspapers. I have heard college presidents talking about it. Two days ago in The New York Times there were three letters in one day about the First Amendment and campus free speech.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Is it safe to conclude from that that the Justice Department is also going through this examination?

MS. KRUGER: That is not our function. Our function is mediators of disputes.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I mean in terms of interpretation of the First Amendment.

MS. KRUGER: No, not that I know of.

Dr. ROSS: If I could also add one more point. When we focus on these events our focus should be broader than the campus itself. The term "tension on campus" is perhaps an incorrect one, especially when you deal with a case of extremist speakers. One could talk perhaps of tensions focusing on the campus.

In the cases of extremist speakers who are coming from off the campus on to the campus, what you have is a building dynamic which involves groups on the campus with groups off the campus. In some instances you have cases of speech on campus in which the problem isn't so much for the groups on campus, but you rather have a problem for people in the larger community.

So therefore the question of interchange between campus tension and community tension and how the two build and feed on each other is a very important one which should be considered as well.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I want to turn next to the second session. Before I do so, I am going to call out of turn our colleague Irving Levine who has been gracious enough to join us today even though his organization and my own organization is in national session at the Marriott.

MR. LEVINE: This meeting is so fascinating, I might be forced to stay.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We will put you ahead anyway.

Mr. Levine is the head of the National Affairs Department of the American Jewish Committee and a very distinguished intergroup relations professional, and again, a personal friend.

MR. LEVINE: Thank you, Murray.

STATEMENT OF MR. IRVING LEVINE

I am very happy to be here. I am delighted that the U.S. Commission is holding this hearing. It is absolutely necessary that we know more about this phenomena.

I think you have heard some terrific presentations. I identify with them. They seem to strike a familiar note in terms of our analysis.

Ms. Kruger, we are delighted with the system that the Community Relations Service seems to have. Our only advice is, please start to communicate it to racial and ethnic organizations a little bit better. We really need much more consultation. We know your New York outfit and we are very friendly, but we do need to talk a little bit more about it.

I want to relate some material from studies we have done and also from experience on over 75 campuses and many, many experiences over the last ten years that I have myself had in doing multi-ethnic training in high schools, and only recently getting warmed up to getting out of my office, have started to go

into colleges and begun to do what I call systemic consultation.

I say that because we have run numerous prejudice reduction workshops with our consultants all over the county. While they have been satisfactory experiences and have proven to us that there is a base of good will among students and among faculty and administrators who want to carry on this program, we have found that they are inadequate in responding to the systemic problems that we see.

The American Jewish Committee is beginning to shift its priorities to systemic institutional consultation, that is, helping universities carry out a total plan in dealing with issues of cultural pluralism, something that we find they are incredibly deficient in and, sad to say, not competent and barely organized except for some excellent places which are the exception to the rule.

I recently spoke to a large group in California, about 150 people. Fifty were faculty members of major universities in the Los Angeles area. I asked those 50, if a racial, ethnic or religious incident took place on your campus, would you know the address for taking care of that incident? Not one person raised their hand. Let me summarize some of our experiences that come out of high schools. We are convinced that some of the statistics we have on national surveys of tolerance, intolerance, acceptance of differences, that they are largely correct; that is, the society is surprisingly becoming more tolerant of differences than ever before. It seems to be a contradiction. At the same time, we are finding that the behavior of the kids is outrageous. They are philosophically tolerant and behavioristically outrageous. They are acting out against each other. There is a large-scale lack of respect for each other, lack of respect for self, reported everywhere. A lot of ethnic bashing verbally and done sometimes with fun. Much self-denigration. That is, black kids call themselves niggers. Other kids use similar epithets for their own group.

The issue of female Jews who are called JAPs begins in the Jewish community and floats out into the larger community and has become, in our opinion — I think the ADL is with us on this — one of the most important and new phenomena of classic anti-Semitism. Since anti-Semitism has become un-kosher it is much easier to bash Jewish women. So you hit two targets at one time. And I will say there is collusion among Jewish men in this attack. Some of it unconscious, some of it venal.

I also head something called the Institute for American Pluralism of the American Jewish Committee which is doing some systemic studies on the psychology of group identity. We cannot avoid the implication that many, many kids have weak self-identities and the findings constantly are that a weak self-identity, an

inadequate sense of group identity, contributes largely to their behavior problems. Those kids who have a strong group identity, we are convinced, are less likely to act out against others in a prejudicial way.

All of the calls from blacks and other minority groups, and lately from Jews, to have public institutions play a role in strengthening group identity is a very, very important basic call, inadequately responded to.

There is a great deal of controversy, as you know, on campus today as to how much cultural diversity ought to be encouraged, what kind of course work ought to be developed, what do you do informally. Are you segregating young people if they are staying in their clubs? Don't you have to mix them? and so on. All these are very controversial issues.

There is a tremendous amount of self-segregation, but we find in the self-segregation there are inadequate positive group identity activities. The self-segregation would be less harmful if there was content that developed around that self-segregation, and we find some places there is and many places there is not.

We did a study just coincidentally because we were doing a large-scale study of ethnic images in the media. We just happened to pick John Adams High School, which became, two or three months after the study, the place where those Howard Beach kids came from. These were largely white ethnic kids. We were interested in seeing what we would find when we took a differential look at the ethnic groupings in that school.

We studied the responses of black and African Americans, Hispanics, Irish, Italians, Asians. That's about it. We discovered a very, very mixed pattern of responses. Those of us who think the black-white dichotomy defines American ethnic relations had better take another look. It is extraordinarily complex, both in the manner in which kids identify positively with their own group and how their own identification impacts on their response to other groups.

We found, in order of seriousness, that Asian kids, Jewish kids, and then black kids thought that they had the greatest problem of prejudice and discrimination. One would have thought it was the black kids who would have come out first on that. That was not the case.

We discovered that there were various tolerance levels, depending upon group identity, with extreme differences based upon cultural background.

We found Italian kids denigrating their own group, black kids denigrating their own group, Hispanic kids denigrating their own group. As a matter of fact, the group's own description was as bad usually in terms of the stereotype as the description attributed to that group by others.

This raises a big question about how complex we are in our analysis. I would say we are being driven by media images rather than our own intellect and our own observations. We are quite frightened, frankly, of the truth of multiculturalism, which is really what the norm is. I think one of the interesting things that is taking place is in areas where the analysis has been rather poverty stricken in terms of traditional non-white minority groups and whites, we are finding when you break whites down there is an extreme differential. We are finding that white kids are reacting against the strengthening of group identity of so-called people of color negatively.

There is a new policy enunciated in the New York City Board of Higher Education. Every school must now do work on multiculturalism and pluralism. They must have consistent policies in this area. The new New York City Board of Education policy is the broadest and most far-reaching that we have seen. Of course it came about because of a historic coalition of blacks, Jews, Hispanics, et cetera. It took 20 years to forge that coalition and get it down. There is some encouragement there.

There are some programmatic and policy implications of all this. The Commission must look broadly at the pluralistic nature of the population that exists. It must include all groups, even white Anglo-Saxon Protestants as an ethnic group in American society with cultural derivations and value differences.

We have done studies recently of sophisticated middle and upper middle class professionals in terms of their values. We find enormous differences, depending upon child rearing. WASP, Irish, Italian, Jewish, black, Hispanic, Asian. Enormous differences. That has to be taken into consideration in any new studies. What we are finding is incredible miscommunication at every level of society. We are missing each others' signals. We don't speak the same language. We do not understand whence we come. So that has to be taken a good look at, and we are beginning to have more systemic studies in that area.

We have to take a look at the inadequate skills of people in our educational system. We are doing a lot of multicultural training and staff development. There is incredible resistance in this field. The whole history of intergroup relations goes back 40 or 50 years on elementary and secondary levels. It hardly has developed yet on campuses. It is just a new thing on campuses.

We have found that you get a bridgehead and a beachhead in elementary and secondary education — cultural, pluralism, or whatever you call it; race relations, or whatever it has been called; or brotherhood — and it dies. We have been doing psychological studies on why all of these well motivated movements for reform have such a short life.

We are convinced now that anything related to ethnicity, race or religion operates psychologically in the same way as sex, death and money: enormous resistance, ambivalence, fear, avoidance, and controversy.

It is difficult for people who are overwhelmed educationally by all kinds of other needs and demands to pay attention to something as essential as good intergroup relations and healthy group identity when they are fearful and there are inadequate possibilities of training them. Our experience has been that once the fears are broken down there is enormous growth in the capacity of teachers to implement good programs.

Kids respond positively to intentional intergroup relations, multi-ethnic and self-identity programs. They like it. I would say they love it. Nobody is asking them who they are. Nobody is giving them an opportunity to rap about their real lives. They are not being taught towards their identity. They are being taught outside of their identity. Most teaching is alienation. Teaching to identity is something quite necessary.

Schools have had enormous success in attempting to change a racial, ethnic and religious climate once they have implemented an intentional system-wide program.

The history of desegregation indicates that it was not true what some of us so-called liberals said. Mixing does not automatically create good will. It helps. Intentional programming on group relations creates it. So if you are not programming for it, you are not doing it. That is true on every level of education.

We have also discovered that youth serving agencies which played a strong role in this field, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, other groups, have diminished their budgets. They tell us that they get money only for special problems, and one of the special problems is no longer prejudice; it's drugs, it's alcohol, it's teenage pregnancy.

We need some legislation in this country and we need restoration of training money in this field. The United States Civil Rights Act gave off enormous amounts of money for school desegregation. Along with it, human relations training. Much of that money has dried up.

There are many, many trained consultants out there who are coming to the rescue of schools in this field, but there is no budget. Thank God that some of the school systems are coming up with the dough. The New York school system just allocated $900,000 for multicultural training and has created a competition among its 30-odd districts with $50,000 to each district. That is the kind of stuff we need. Much will flow from that competition. I have seen the proposals and I have seen the programs. There are people in all of our cities who are trained in this field,

who can give assistance, and they need to also be brought into this framework.

I will conclude on that. There have been 20 years of ethnic advocacy, and I have been part of that movement. We need five more years of coalition building, return to intergroup relations; we need to systematize skills training in this field; and we need to transmit to young people, and they will buy if we provide it.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Levine. I hope you can stay for the end of this session so that you may be subjected to some questions as well.

The next person on our list is Dr. Reginald Wilson, who is described as senior scholar, Office of Minority Concerns, American Council on Education.

STATEMENT OF DR. REGINALD WILSON

DR. WILSON: I have a formal statement. Copies can be distributed and you can read it at your leisure.

I think as you have already found out from the previous comments it is very difficult to separate this into three neat areas of the extent, the causes and solutions. Everybody has had a crack at causes and I think much less on the other aspects.

I would certainly agree with Dr. Ross that part of the creation of the problem is due to the fact that indeed there are minorities on campus. There would be no problem if they were not there. I think there is a considerable difference between what happened on campuses during the 1960s and what is happening now during the 1980s.

Certainly I would agree with Dr. Balch that there hasn't been a significant change in the expression of racism on predominately white campuses. It has always been there. I have been around on campuses for an awful long time and have seen it over those years.

I think there is a qualitative difference in the expression because of the nature of circumstances, such as the antiapartheid movement that you talked about and some of the other current things that have caused some exacerbation of tensions on campuses over particular issues, but certainly in terms of the expression of blatant racism on predominately white campuses. It has always been there. I went to predominately white universities for all of my degrees and I certainly saw it there.

I think the fact that often you let some things go by is due to the fact that there were not sufficient numbers to do anything about it. For example, at the University of Michigan during my day about the only minority people who were there were athletes. There were not enough to hold a protest at the University of Michigan. Now you have got enough to hold a protest. Some of the things that are being protested are things that have been at

the University of Michigan all along. So the critical mass is certainly an aspect of the difference in the way in which minority students are responding.

You also have some differences in terms of the perception of resources. Resource allocation is a key factor in terms of the way in which people perceive what is happening on campuses. In the 1960s much of the action that had to do with race relations was not happening on campuses; it was happening in the general society. As a consequence, there was a good deal of unification between black students and white students because the problem was out there, not on campuses.

I took large numbers of white students from Brooklyn College, from Michigan State, from the University of Michigan down to the South to work on voter registration campaigns and to work in Virginia on setting up alternative schools when segregated schools were closed down rather than to integrate them. They were very eager to participate in these kind of activities even at the risk of their lives. But it was a problem that was out there. It didn't have anything to do with the campuses that they came from because those campuses were almost totally white.

I think what you see as a significant difference in the 1980s is that these problems are on the campuses, and that changes the dynamic. You are talking about the resources on those campuses being seen as finite, or at least they are portrayed that way. As a consequence, many people on campuses, not only white students, but white faculty as well, perceive it as a zero sum game. That is, if you get some, I lose some. As a result, the presence of increasing numbers of black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American students on these campuses is seen as an encroachment on white entitlement. Part of the resentment and hostility is due to that perception.

It is also due to student ignorance, which Mr. Levine talked about. The knowledge of most of your 19- or 20-year-olds goes back about three and a half years in terms of knowledge of history despite coming from many of our best schools.

Because our leaders on campus — I include the faculty in that — have for years not taught the history of this country to their students, they have come to campus not only ignorant of what the intent of many programs on campuses are about, but often in many cases are encouraged by faculty to distort their perceptions of that history, the history of racism, the history of legal segregation in this society, the history of segregation sanctioned by practices of the Federal Government, state governments, and institutions who colluded for many years to systematically exclude American racial minorities from their campuses.

What you see now are feeble efforts on the part of these campuses to redress some of these grievances and often the leaders

of those campuses, faculty and administrators and presidents, do not portray that as what it is indeed, a redressing of systemic discrimination that has existed in this society since it was founded and have not explained to white students that that is what they are about.

Indeed, they tend to abet white students in perceiving that this is a distortion from what ought to be. So students are perceived as undeserving who come on campus; they are perceived as getting privileges which are not "coming to us" as white students; students coming through EOP programs, coming in with Pell grants, and so forth, are considered as being treated with some kind of special circumstance which is not available to students who are in the majority, and they have no sense of why that is being done.

As a consequence, the frustration is abetted by the practices of the faculty and of the administration. The lack of leadership is startling in that regard. When you see its absence on campuses, it is a conscious practice; it is not an unconscious one. Our curriculum has been swept clean, washed clean of any sense of the kind of discriminatory practices that had existed in the society of which these efforts are an attempt to redress.

You also had expanding resources in the 1960s, so people felt that they could share. You had the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. You had the pouring of millions of dollars into programs that seemed to add to access for people. As a result of that and a very positive national leadership, that is, a presidential leadership which encouraged that, which created a climate of support, and which also created a climate of enforcement, enforcement to the extent of saying this is what you must do, institutions were scrambling to do it.

Being one of the products of that period, I recall that the way of recruiting of faculty in many instances was not through your normal search processes, which all professors now hold sacred. In the 1960s, when they were told to clean up their act, I received a call from the chair of the department of psychology at the University of Michigan inviting me to come and be an assistant professor at U of M.

Many others who came during the 1960s came in that way, by institutions scrambling to change what had been systematic discriminatory practices. That no longer is happening. They thought the laws were going to be enforced, that the Federal Government was going to insist that they change their practice, so they were scrambling to do so. Now you find that they have not only stopped those kind of aggressive recruitment practices for faculty and students, but they are indeed going in the opposite direction.

Very little recruitment of any kind is going on in graduate schools and in professional schools, and the numbers are showing that. In 1975 there were 1,213 doctorates awarded to black Americans. In 1987 there were 725. Institutions are not making any significant efforts to recruit minority scholars. I think it is a circumstance that is nothing less than disgraceful. I think it is a symptom of what is now being perceived as a situation of finite resources, of a zero sum circumstance, and that they are aiding and abetting in many instances the students' and others perceptions that there is something wrong with minorities being on campuses.

So the lack of leadership is certainly a major problem. The lack of educational programs to educate students, sensitize them, as Mr. Levine said, I do not think are accidental. It is not as though we don't know about these things.

He and I and many other people worked during the 1960s in school desegregation programs, working with training teachers, working with people in communities in dispute resolution. Those skills are all around. There are still some of us not confined to wheelchairs who know about those skills and are very able and available to teach them.

I don't think institutions want them. I think they are not feeling any particular urge to do so. I think the only thing that is causing them to act at this point in time is the fact of these embarrassing incidents. I think that puts a black eye on the academy.

I don't think that the University of Michigan would have made any significant attempt to increase the number of its doctoral students which in the 1970s were over 400 for blacks alone and in the 1980s were less than 200 and are now just beginning to go up again. I think that the only thing were those marches on campus at U of M and at other schools that insisted on some changes in university policy. I think it's a mark of the impact of those student demonstration that last fall the University of Michigan hired 18 black tenure track faculty, which is more than it has ever done in the history of that institution in any one academic year.

Most do not have any clear policies or sanctions against this kind of behavior, and in fact are ambivalent about whether indeed they need to develop them. You have the difference between Stanford taking incredible amounts of heat from the academic community for offering a course in world civilization, which is mild at best, and the University of Michigan voting down by its faculty the offering of such a course.

So there is a great deal of ambivalence on campuses as to whether in fact these issues ought to be addressed head on. One would expect that campus leaders would hope that it would

simply go away. Much of what is happening is a consequence of great denial.

We have a difference in terms of the national climate that existed in the 1960s. There was a positive climate; there was a positive sense of enforcement. We do not have that positive climate nor that kind of leadership coming from the federal level, nor do we have that sense of enforcement. I think the fact that it is not being enforced has a great deal to do with the decline of the minority presence on campuses in many instances.

There is no question that there is intragroup as well as intergroup conflict. After listening to the discussion of the last several minutes, we want to forget that indeed the major topic that we are discussing here is incidents of racial activity against racial minorities. That is what it is about. That is where it began. The majority of those instances are against blacks. There are subsequent tiers of instances. Independent of how people feel, the level of racism is in society as it is visited on their particular group. Nevertheless, any look at the compilation of statistics either by the Community Relations Service or by the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, or the Institute on Towson State campus, would all attest to that fact, that we are dealing with incidents against primarily black Americans, subsequently against Asians and Hispanics, and against Jews.

I think the focus ought to be on where those efforts are being directed, what it is causing in disruption in society, and what it is doing in making the campus climate inharmonious for racial minorities.

Finally, let me share with you a document published by the American Council on Education last year that was intended to raise this issue to the level of national consciousness. The National Commission on Minority Participation in Education, which ACE established, published "One-Third of a Nation" and talked about what the consequences of not dealing with this problem would be for our country. Copies of that document were distributed to all members of Congress, all college and university presidents, and to many organizations like this as well.

In addition, we have developed a document which was just issued in January of this year called "Minorities on Campus," which is a handbook of strategies designed to assist institutions to develop programs that will successfully recruit, retain and maintain the minority presence on campus.

They are not theoretical recommendations but are based on the actual programs on campuses that have been proven to work in affirmative action.

Despite affirmative action getting a rather black eye from some circles, I have yet to hear critics offer a better program for achieving the same aim. So as flawed as it may be, nevertheless some

institutions have been able to develop successful affirmative action programs at the faculty and at the student level.

Miami University in Ohio, for example, doubled their black faculty in just a little over one academic year. Despite that being investigated by the Department of Justice, they found no cause for complaint about the effectiveness, the fairness and the legality of their affirmative action practices. It can happen and the sky does not fall.

Institutions also have been successful in their student recruitment programs. It may very well be true that there may be two-tier structures for admitting students into the academy. The question is, do they meet the same standards when they come out? That is what I thought the purpose of an education was.

There is no question that part of the redress of the grievances of minorities in the society who have been systematically denied education is how do you make up for that. What I find most academics and institutions say is you don't do nothing about it; it's tough, but I'm sorry; and let's wait until maybe the 21st century and see what happens.

We are suggesting that not only should we be working on eliminating these problems in the 21st century, but we ought to do something about them now.

In order to do something about them now, we may in fact have to have different admission criteria for various groups in order to bring them into the academy. The question I ask is, what is the quality of their degree when they get out? That, it seems to me, is the standard of justice. As they say, the guy who graduates at the bottom of his class in medical school is still called doctor.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much, Dr. Wilson. I think it is very important to have your input, particularly in view of the varying points of view that we are bringing to the table.

Our next panelist brings a special perspective. He's someone who presumably is able to share with us some of these issues from the perspective of the campus student body. Patrick Cheng is a member of Campuses Against Racist Violence and will present this from the perspective of the student.

STATEMENT OF PATRICK CHENG

MR. CHENG: Thank you, Mr. Friedman. My name is Patrick Cheng, and I just finished my junior year at Yale University yesterday. I really appreciate the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights having this hearing. I think it is important that students are heard with regards to this issue.

I thought I would give the subcommittee a perspective on where I come from in terms of my work with people of color. It might help your questioning.

I was one of the cofounders of Campuses Against Racist Violence, which is a coalition of 40 colleges in the Northeast and the Eastern United States. We keep track of various incidents of racist violence as well as learn from each other. We hold conferences for schools to get ideas from other schools how to combat this.

I have also been involved as president of Dwight Hall at Yale, which is the community service and volunteer activist center, which involves 2,500 students at Yale. My involvement with minority activities stems from the fact that I was the first minority president in 102 years to hold that slot at an institution like Dwight Hall.

Finally, I have just finished my term as a member on Yale's Committee on Freedom of Expression in terms of the conflict between controversial speakers and what constitutes harassment. I spent the last seven months talking with Yale law professors about these First Amendment issues.

What I want to talk about today is not necessarily to argue about whether the perception of racist violence has gone up or whether it has actually gone up. None of this medieval philosophy, how many angels fit on the tip of a pin? I think the fact is that we do have evidence of these things happening. I want to focus my comments not just on the affirmative action issues, but also specific racist violence, physical violence and verbal violence, on people of color, women, religious minorities, and sexual minorities.

In terms of causes, I would like to raise some causes that people have not necessarily talked about. These come from talking to a lot of students in the last several years.

One of the main things that students feel is that the reversal of the in *loco parentis policy* that universities have taken recently leads to increased violence. Universities used to take more care of the students, being responsible for their actions, acting as their parents. Once the Supreme Court did away with that structure, the universities are saying, well, our only responsibility is to hold these people legally accountable; you can take them to the court system and do that. In other words, they are saying to a lot of campus bigots that "we're not going to do anything about it; you have to find a solution, an alternative way." That is one of the main problems.

Another problem, I think, is that we are the first generation not to have personally experienced a lot of the civil rights struggles that have gone on in the 1960s or in the mid-1970s with Boston, with the busing, riots, and so on and so forth.

Dr. Balch raised a good point. The students are starting to question the gains that we have made in the last couple of years. They don't understand the reasons behind affirmative action.

They see it only as something that exists. What happens is they don't view it as something that is bringing us up to an equal level to have a fair chance. Rather, they see it as taking away from them. That is where I think a lot of hostility from students comes from.

They misunderstand support services and the need for ethnic houses. They always complain about minorities having black tables or Asian tables. But then what about all those artsy tables or jock tables that people never think about? And what about all those white tables? How self-integrated are they? It is easy to spot a group of minorities together, so people use that as a scapegoat.

Also, in terms of admissions policies, we hardly hear about people complaining about athletes getting preferential treatment, but when it comes to minorities, that is a different story.

So I think in terms of hostilities and misconceptions, that is another important cause.

A third cause that I was hoping someone would raise is in terms of the leadership of our government in setting the agenda. It comes from the top down, from the Oval Office down. Last year we saw a paralysis of a lot of people in terms of dealing with these issues. What kind of message are you sending to 18-year-old kids when the solicitor general is in the Supreme Court every other day arguing against affirmative action? What kind of message are you sending when the Supreme Court is stacked with justices that have written scathing opinions about these programs that were enacted? What kind of message are you sending when the Executive branch does not give attention to minority issues and is silent?

The silence is greeted by these students as sort of a tacit approval. If you don't say it is not okay, then we will go ahead and do it. That is what one of the biggest problems stems from.

I think the Asian violence issue has been covered. I think we are in a weird position. We are attacked on either side because of the model minority myth, and also a lot of the perceptions that people have about Asian Americans.

I would just like to briefly talk about solutions both before an incident has occurred and after it from the student's point of view.

I think it is clear that the government has to take an active role in sending a message. It is not enough to look at these small things, but on the level of "just say no" or the AIDS education program. President Bush has got to go out there and say, look, our nation will not put up with this. I am talking about incidents of minorities that get their heads beaten in and spit upon.

What we need is more like Senator Simon's hate crime statistics bill. I just read a couple of days ago that only 44 Senators

support that bill. It just does not seem to me that something that deals with this issue is ideologically charged.

Similarly, on a college level it is important for college presidents to set the goal. I think President Gregarian at Brown has done an impressive job after that scrawling incident on the bathroom walls recently. He sent out a letter to all the parents saying, look, I will not tolerate this; if we find them, we are going to expel them, and we are doing this, this, this.

People need to be vocal and students need to hear that in order to shape our opinions. Students of color need to be on decision-making bodies and committees. Not because we are students of color, but because we have had experiences that can help legislate more efficient running of the university.

In terms of after the incidents, another thing that I was sort of hoping that someone would mention was in terms of money talks. That is about the only thing that universities listen to. In terms of the federal programs, they need to shut off federal funding. I think a lot of times the current programs are inefficient.

I was reading over the procedures for Title VI and Title IX complaints. You have to go to the attorney general and file a formal complaint and then go through all the government red tape.

I think there should be a sort of congressional commission or something that could look at schools that have had patterns of racist violence and say, look, if you don't correct these, we are going to shut off funding, and you are going to have to tell us what sort of steps you are going to take. Sort of like an affirmative action plan in terms of racist violence. Not just hiring. For schools that have had problems, you are going to tell me what you are doing before we give you back the funding.

In terms of solutions for this, the answer is not to ban controversial speakers on campus or to put more restrictions on defining what harassment is. I think Stanford's recent incident with the lips drawn on Beethoven, they had their committee look at these things. When you try to make the definitions more strict, people look for loopholes. It's a double-edged sword, because then those same principles of censorship can be applied to minority groups. What is not acceptable, though, is to say that you can harass other people under the disguise of free expression.

From reading over this report, I have three points that I would hope you would take into consideration.

It was suggested to the Commission that you define the scope of what racist violence is. I think that goes along with the idea of precisely defining things. You need to emphasize the educational aspects and the informal mechanisms more than making the stringent definitions. You naturally have to say that harass-

ment is not okay, but I don't think the answer is to go down and break that down.

Also, I think the summary unfairly summarizes the causes for the increase in violence. We don't know if it is due to just increased perception or actually more incidents. To use phrases like "such claims are merely perceptions" or "it is not at all clear," my perspective in talking to hundreds of students is that there is a problem and that we need to get the statistics services. Y o u have approached the Congress twice. Do it 200 more times until a bill gets passed through. It is important that you stay with it and not say, well, we have already done it.

We, students, although the work that we do is beneficial in terms of educating and supporting ourselves, we can't hold the burden. Trying to do something like this in terms of funding, communications with other students, with the turnover is almost impossible, and it is frustrating. You have to educate people every single time you meet someone over again. I think the burden needs to be an active burden, either on your Commission lobbying for more changes, or through the Congress itself.

Finally, when your statement says you are wondering about whether gay students should be included, I think it would be hypocritical for this Commission not to acknowledge the factors that involve gay students precisely for the reasons I have raised before. Where do you draw the line? Once you condone a certain kind of violence against a certain minority group, who says that can't be applied to other groups?

My feeling in talking to most people is that violence towards gays is going to be a major issue in the next five or ten years. That is something that is brewing. Just because it is not under Title VI or Title IX doesn't mean that you can ignore it, or if it's a politically charged thing.

I appreciate your work. I hope you take these into consideration. If we don't fight this, who will?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Cheng. Your comments have been particularly helpful. Perhaps it is appropriate that we turn now to Dr. Thomas Short, who may have somewhat differing points of view with regards to some of these issues.

Dr. Short is associate professor of philosophy at Kenyon College and will assess the effect that affirmative action programs and cultural studies may have had in exacerbating tensions.

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS SHORT

DR. SHORT: Thank you.

I was actually asked to do this at the last minute, and my understanding of my responsibility is a little different from yours,

but the parts of this problem do interconnect so intimately that it doesn't make much difference.

I thought I was asked to speak particularly to the way in which college curricula might be used to combat racism, and so I will talk about that. I should like to approach that topic, however, through some reflections on campus racism in general.

Everyone agrees on distinguishing between racial hostility and mere insensitivity. In almost every account of campus racial problems I have read both are mentioned, but little is made of the distinction. Hostility and insensitivity are distinguished yet lumped together. This, I think, is a mistake since their causes are not the same and the treatment should not be the same.

Insensitivity of whites toward blacks is rooted less in prejudice than in unfamiliarity and curiosity and simple lack of tact. Insensitivity has existed since the day when the first black student set foot on a predominately white campus. Every since I began teaching, which was not in that day, I have heard black students complain in private, rarely in public, until recently, about white students who either stereotype them or exhibit an annoying curiosity.

A white girl with the best of intentions asked a black girl to join a singing group. The latter replied that she couldn't sing. You can probably guess the reaction. "But I thought all you people could sing," the white girl responded, genuinely surprised. Again, when the topic has to do with civil rights or slavery or jazz or when a black person is on television, black students become conscious that their reactions are being examined by their white peers. This obviously makes them uncomfortable, and the whites ought to know that, but they don't. They're kids.

Ignorance and curiosity unmodified by tact are what these kinds of insensitivity amount to. If there is more insensitivity now than before, I suspect it is do to an additional third factor, an exaggerated fear of giving offense. As everyone's attention is directed to race and as whites become more aware of black resentment at insensitive treatment, we shall see white students nervously bumbling even more than before.

We shall see, too, another manifestation, not exactly of insensitivity, but of strained racial relations; namely, whites avoiding blacks for fear of saying or doing the wrong thing. We already see that and black students already complain of being treated as if they were invisible.

I do not mean to downplay the seriousness of insensitivity. I know that there is much of it and I know that it presents real problems to black students along with the other problems they undeniably have.

By the way, I am focusing on black students, not other minority students, but what I have to say probably applies to others in some degree.

I do not mean to blame the victim by saying that black readiness to perceive a slight where none is intended makes a bad situation worse. Black students are sensitive. Maybe sometimes oversensitive. It does make a bad situation worse, but the situation is bad to begin with, and that is not their fault. That is in fact how they came to be sensitive.

What I am driving at, however, is that as far as insensitivity is concerned, on both sides there are no real villains. No one is acting out of bad motives and it is counterproductive, therefore, to label insensitivity as a form of racism, implying that those who are insensitive are somehow of a type with Bull Connor. This will only get white students' backs up, making them resentful of false accusation, and I might add, rightly resentful, though in saying that I do not mean to condone the ways in which that resentment is likely to be expressed.

So what should be done? If the ultimate source of insensitivity is ignorance and curiosity and lack of tact, then shouldn't we teach tact through sensitivity training sessions and remove ignorance and satisfy curiosity by requiring all students to take courses in minorities' cultures? I think not. For two reasons.

Let me first say that I was very impressed with what Mr. Levine said and so far as possible I would like to put myself on his side. Given what I am going to say, it will be very difficult to do, because I seem to be contradicting him outright. The way I would like to pull that off is by suggesting that what is good and will work at the lower levels of the school system would be inappropriate and won't work in higher education.

At least in higher education the attempt to use our schools to mold attitudes, however good we believe those attitudes to be, subverts the educational enterprise. Of course we hope that knowledge, intellectual training, and free and open discussion of controversial issues will result in all manner of good things, including better citizens with better attitudes. But that is a far cry from beginning with a conception of the attitudes we deem desirable and then fashioning the curriculum and student life to meet that specific goal.

Such a curriculum, designed to achieve a specific attitude change, makes a mockery of academic freedom and reflects a totalitarian desire to impose uniformity, to control even the thoughts and feelings of others.

Furthermore, sensitivity training and minority studies will not work. Can you really mold attitudes in a classroom? Again, I am thinking more of higher education than the lower schools. Can you mold attitudes when it is quite clear that that is what

you mean to do? Even if students cannot articulate the principles of academic freedom they will resent being manipulated instead of being educated. Thus one reason why attitude adjustment won't work is because it is wrong in principle and will be seen to be wrong.

Courses in minority cultures, however, are not the same thing as sensitivity training. Such courses need not have the specific aim of making students more tolerant. They can be just straight forward, good academic studies of their subjects without any ulterior motive.

I have nothing against such courses. However, in the present environment ethnic studies are being perverted by those who wish to use them to change society and students' attitudes. As soon as they are taught with that purpose—and only such a purpose explains why they are now being suggested as requirements for all students—then their intellectual integrity is destroyed.

There is a further reason why minority studies or ethnic studies or multicultural education, call it what you will, must fail to correct racial insensitivity, and that is that it will in fact exacerbate it. It will foist a spurious cultural unity on black students who are in fact not all of one subculture; it will create differences between whites and blacks where none exist and exaggerate the differences that do exist; it will make black students objects of curiosity to white students even more than they are already; and it will reinforce the suspicion many black students unfortunately have that by succeeding in the standard curriculum they are somehow selling out to the white world.

The idea that black Americans have a different culture from that of white Americans is somewhere between very misleading and ridiculous.

It goes to the ridiculous when African American cultures are associated with African culture as something belonging to the Third World and as standing outside of the white majority's supposedly Eurocentric perspective. Without denying the African roots of some aspects of the lives of many black Americans, without denying the African roots of some of the greatest contributions black Americans have made to our common culture, it is ridiculous nevertheless to suppose that black Americans have more in common culturally with Africans than with their fellow Americans. They share a society with the latter, not with the former.

They share the last two centuries of history more or less, with their white fellow citizens, and not with their remoter African ancestors. Even though the history is one of slavery, injustice, prejudice, discrimination, and so on, we are bound together by it. Then, too, let us not forget that it was the ideals of the Anglo-American tradition which led whites to demand an end to slavery

and later it forced whites to agree with the demands of the black civil rights movement to end discrimination. There was no principle on the basis of which that could be resisted.

And black Americans share language with white Americans and not with most black Africans. How can they be supposed to share a culture with those with whom they cannot converse? This idea could have gained currency only through some mystique of race. Even when not carried to that racist extreme, and it isn't always carried to that extreme, so-called multicultural education still categorizes people by color and treats individuals who are very different by their talents, interests and experiences as being the same and people who are very much the same in terms of their talents, interests and experiences as being different because of their color. This is supposed to teach mutual toleration, the proponents of this say, but of course it will do nothing of the kind. It will only accentuate the racial lines that are already too well drawn on our campuses.

Let me go back to what Mr. Levine said.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I thought you were agreeing with Mr. Levine.

DR. SHORT: As I say, I would like to.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I would like you to, too, but it doesn't sound like it.

DR. SHORT: I think what he said about the strength of a person's self-concept and the dependency on that of group identification, the importance to that of a positive concept of the group, all that makes sense to me in terms of younger kids and what could be done with them and for them in the lower schools. But when we are talking about higher education, I don't think we are any longer talking about culture in the same sense.

Consider the testimony of the black football player at Oberlin College, who said that "he has come to know whites because he has worked closely with them on the team" and "he feels more hostility from some of his black classmates." He is not denying that he feels some hostility from whites at Oberlin college, but he makes the point he feels more hostility from some of his black classmates.

This student shows how racial barriers can be broken down. Barriers are not broken down by equating culture with color, but by working with people of other races on matters of mutual interest, on matters that transcend questions of race.

This student's experience with some other black students reveals also a problem that exists already that will be made worse if the assumption that blacks are culturally different from whites gains greater currency. This problem is the pressure some black students impose on other black students to conform to black self-segregation. This greatly interferes with education for black

students, particularly when it is translated into curricular terms.

Furthermore, most observers agree that segregation on campus is a major cause of the incidents of insensitivity and hostility between the races. How could the false doctrine that there is a black culture distinct from white culture be expected to improve that situation? Obviously it rationalizes segregation and thereby reinforces it.

I can take a bit of strength here again from Mr. Levine who points out the importance of the vast number of ethnic subcultures among whites. I would imagine that there are also differences among blacks. There is a black middle class, for example, that is very different, and blacks in the South must have a very different kind of experience from blacks in northern cities.

Indeed many proponents of the so-called multicultural education know full well that the invention of differences or merely their exaggeration will foster minority militancy and racially biased political movements.

It is no accident that on my own campus it is white radical faculty who have initiated the demands (being heard on many other campuses also) for a minority cultural center, for a special orientation for black students, for coordinators of minority affairs, for ethnic studies requirements, and so on.

In this connection, I would urge the Commission to remember the difference between rhetoric and reality, between the words, even of those who are well meaning, and the way those policies will be implemented on individual campuses.

In conclusion, let me make two brief comments about genuine racism expressed by hostile acts as opposed to insensitivity.

First, while attitudes cannot in our legal system be punished and shouldn't be punished on campuses, administrators have not in general been sufficiently swift and firm in punishing actions, especially violent acts or threats of violence. I would agree wholeheartedly with everything that has been said on that topic.

Second, hostile acts are increasing as an expression not always of the prejudice whites bring with them to college, but as an expression of the prejudice they learn there out of the resentment of preferential treatment being shown minorities and the resentment of being falsely charged with racism. I don't mean to say those two things are the only causes. There is also, obviously, a lack of prior commitment to the genuine ideals of equality.

One can oppose affirmative action, for example, as in principle wrong or unwise without expressing that in any racist form. Conversely, of course, those who do oppose it should not be called racists unless they express their opposition by racial insult.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Dr. Short. It seems to me you have joined the issues on several fronts.

We really had planned to have three sessions, but by virtue of moving Levine up front, who presumably had to get out of here very early, I am going to ask the last speaker to speak now and then we can have a broader discussion with all of us joining in.

Let me introduce for the last report or panel discussant, Dr. Robert Dunham, who is Vice President and Vice Provost of Penn State, who will describe the model program that Penn State has developed to prevent incidents in the first place and to alleviate tension once an incident has occurred.

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT DUNHAM

DR. DUNHAM: I am not sure I care for the word "model." It is one way of doing it. It is not necessarily the best, but I am not sure what is the best.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We'll decide.

DR. DUNHAM: Let me talk about a case study. Since you may have read or heard about Penn State in many public media, let me set the context.

We are a large university in a fairly small white rural area of the middle of Pennsylvania. Out of 109 four-year institutions in Pennsylvania, the second most populated university among blacks is Penn State. There are 2,580 blacks enrolled, which is not nearly as large as we would like, but nevertheless that is what we have. Temple is the only school in the state of Pennsylvania with a higher black population, including Lincoln and Cheyney.

Minority enrollment at Penn State has increased 79.3 percent between 1982 and 1988. This is in contrast to a total enrollment increase of only 9.3 percent during the same period.

Between 1982 and 1988 the number of blacks graduating from high schools in Pennsylvania decreased approximately 15 percent. During the same period the number of blacks attending Penn State did not decrease, but in fact increased significantly.

There are more blacks and minorities attending Penn State this year than at any time in the university's history. More blacks graduated from Penn State in 1988 than in any previous year, the third consecutive year of new record black graduates.

Penn State along with MIT and the University of California at Berkeley are the top three research universities producing black undergraduates who eventually earn doctoral degrees in the sciences. That was between 1980 and 1984, according to the National Research Council.

I say that only to set the context for the comments I am going to make right now.

This has been a most interesting and troubling year. At colleges and universities all over the country acts of racism and bigotry have been experienced, and we have heard about those today. At Penn State they have taken the form of racist slurs and posters,

racial harassment, and alleged racial intimidation; anti-Semitic remarks, graffiti and posters and harassment and threatening statements towards lesbians and gays. The most repugnant and threatening statement, entitled "Why Should One Kill Homosexuals" was sent via computer network to all parts of the country and some places abroad.

There is no way when we look at all of these to measure the extent of these activities against a national yardstick, but I am confident that our environment was far better than it was depicted in big city media. The state attorney general's staff which came to our community for about two months this past semester has shared information that would tend to support this conclusion. However, any act of intolerance in our community is a reason for us to support those affected and to continue our vigilance against racism and bigotry.

Penn State has in place a model which deals with environmental concerns. A campus environment team has been meeting every week this year to review systematically the reported incidents and to assess the campus environment. This team includes the vice president for administration, the vice president for student services, the vice president and vice provost, the affirmative action officer, the director of the black studies program, and chair of the equal opportunity planning committee, the director of the campus life assistance center, and the director of public information, and the director of university safety.

As appropriate, this team either visits student groups or invites students in to discuss concerns. It also addresses urgent concerns and ways to improve the environment and makes recommendations to the appropriate offices and in many cases directly to the office of the president. Many of the programs and activities initiated this past year were recommended by the team. In my judgment, its role is invaluable.

A second feature of the model is to speak out strongly and quickly against acts of intolerance. The president has been very willing to fulfill this role. He has made public pronouncements in newspaper ads, in letters to the editor, in radio and television spots, and in public forums.

The president also has been instrumental in encouraging others to speak out. The mayor of State College, for example, the superintendent of the State College area schools and other community leaders have spoken out against racism and bigotry on radio and in newspaper ads.

I might add, the mayor was just challenged recently for speaking out by a write-in candidate, but two days ago the mayor held out and won that election.

They also joined the president in hanging the banner "United Against Racism and Bigotry" on Old Main and also at the

intersection of town and gown. The local radio stations have donated over 500 radio spots and the local newspaper has donated several full-page ads to this purpose.

Other community groups have also joined this chorus. The People's National Bank purchased and distributed over 20,000 "United Against Racism" buttons, and they went in a very short period of time.

The United Methodist Church leaders in the region placed an ad in the local newspaper condemning racism.

The Downtown Business Association passed a resolution condemning racism and tied yellow ribbons on the doors of their establishment.

The leaders of the Presbyterian Church issued a pastoral letter condemning racism and bigotry.

The State College branch of AAUW passed a resolution.

The Alliance Christian Fellowship featured a message: "Racism has no place in the church." And so forth and so on.

The university faculty senate unanimously approved a resolution condemning the racial incidents.

The Graduate Council passed a resolution and the board of trustees passed a resolution.

You may think these are token gestures, but I must say that all of those together throughout the community added a great deal of support and influence.

A third part of the model seeks to move beyond pronouncements and encourage all parts of the university and also community groups to take specific action and to plan programs to deal with racism and bigotry. There have been many actions taken this year. Let me mention a few.

After years of insisting that affirmative action is the responsibility of all units at Penn State, we are about to hire a vice provost whose principal responsibility will be equal opportunity for underrepresented peoples, including women.

This, incidentally, Dr. Short, is different from what appeared in your article. We did not hire a vice provost for pan-African affairs.

We have appointed a 25-member advisory commission on racial ethnic diversity which reports to the president through the new vice provost. I am confident that this group will add significantly to the university's efforts toward a more diverse community.

We have engaged a three-member team of social scientists, all external to Penn State, who are advising us on matters relating to improving the climate for minorities at Penn State. One member of the team was selected by the African American students, one by the administration, and one was selected jointly. They presented us with an interim report in March and the final report is forthcoming any day now.

A director of university safety and the chief of police in State College met with about 350 African American students to discuss precautions for their safety and to discuss areas which needed to have increased security.

A mobile escort service was also initiated; a reward fund was created and announced; a new hotline was established to improve the climate and deal with rumors.

The president has asked each dean and executive officer to assure that there is a minority representation on all of their policymaking bodies. We have initiated a new diversity component in the required freshman testing, counseling and advising program beginning next week at all locations enrolling freshmen. Over 95 percent of our new freshmen participate in this program with at least one parent.

We have met on numerous occasions with top officials of local media and community leaders and organizations and with student groups to encourage them to plan activities and programs. The president sent a letter to all student organizations urging them to plan programs for next year. So this is not just one semester and over, but a continuing concern that we have.

I can't begin to cover all of them, but let me give you a flavor. The State College Hotel/Motel Committee of our Lion Country Visitor and Convention Bureau met recently to address diversity issues and to plan their activities.

The Downtown Business Association is working with Penn State's University Relations Office to initiate at least two diversity workshops this summer for employees of downtown business establishments, and they will focus on behaviors of employees.

Sigma Phi Epsilon, a white fraternity, and Kappa Alpha Psi, a black fraternity, met recently to discuss how two fraternities could deal with racism and with each other. If I had time, I could tell you all the details. I thought it was a marvelous evening, and I wish more student groups would come together like this. Sometimes I think if administrators got out of the way students could solve a lot of the problems.

Another feature of the model is to keep the channels of communication open both ways. It is very important for central administration to communicate with student groups of all kinds and with faculty and staff groups and with families of students. This required those of us in the president's office to be available to students quickly and often. We have talked and listened to hundreds of students and with numerous student, faculty and staff groups this year.

The distribution of a family newsletter to families of all undergraduate students at all locations, the parent meetings in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Harrisburg during spring break, and

the 800 number hotline were attempts to keep those channels open with parents.

Despite the attempts at open communication, confrontation is not always avoided. Such was the case late in the spring semester. A group of African American students reinstituted some of the demands of a year ago. Although they had been responded to before, some of our answers were no, and that was not well received. Nevertheless, we responded again and to inform the broader community printed our response in a paid ad in the student newspaper, the town newspaper, and in the weekly university publication. We hope we can get beyond these demands of a year ago and look to the future.

Even with the significant accomplishments towards sensitizing our community, there is no doubt in my mind that the political agenda of some African American students — and I emphasize some, because you cannot put them all in the same box or group — but some of the African American students is exacerbating our situation.

It has fostered a white backlash and we believe it is causing more moderate African American students to look for a university setting with less group intimidation. This at a time when those same African American student activists criticize the university for not attracting more African American students, and of course there are other underrepresented minority students standing in the wings, waiting for consideration.

And don't overlook the lesbian and gay students, faculty and staff. They could have the hottest issues for this coming year. I don't think it is going to be five years. I think it is right here, right now.

Finally, a recent report published by Northern Illinois University concludes by saying "The renewed trend towards intolerance must not be allowed to gain a foothold on college campuses. It demeans individuals, creates barriers for equality of opportunity, and fragments the learning community. Colleges and universities must take a much more active role in developing a climate for minority student success, promoting an appreciation for diversity, and communicating through action an unwavering intolerance for discrimination." And that is precisely what we are about at Penn State.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Thank you, sir.

I must say this is one of the most enlightening and most exciting of the briefings that we have conducted in my tenure at the Civil Rights Commission. I think we have had a multiplicity of points of view. I think many issues have been joined. I hope there is enough energy for a lively discussion. There certainly should be such a discussion.

I am told that Messrs. Ross and Short have to leave somewhat early. So I am going to suggest to the Commissioners that they address their questions first to them and then we will have us all join in in a group discussion.

First we will take a short recess.

(Recess.)

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are ready to begin.

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

Let's start with Commissioner Chan.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: I must say I have received an education today from all of you.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I am going to urge you to make your questions short and single.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: I have some notes here, but I will make some short comments. Dr. Ross mentioned that on the campus the problem is drugs, alcohol, majority versus minority and the solution is to work from below. What do you mean by work from below?

DR. BALCH: Dr. Ross is gone.

MR. LEVINE: Dr. Chan, let me say something about the antisocial behavior that we see taking place. There is much more of it in general, the drugs, alcohol, and sexual acting out. It does have an impact on bigotry. The extremes of acting out behavior flow over into racial, ethnic and religious intolerance. We are seeing a lot of so-called innocent acting out that comes from broken family life, beginning to become part of the index in this field. We ought to take it seriously.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: I have two more short questions.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Let's have one each time. Then we want to get into a roundtable discussion.

Esther.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY: Let me preface this by telling you that I am a high school teacher in a high school in Texas. We do happen to have a very large minority population, but the whole city has a large minority.

We have looked at the regional forums and the changing demographics and how we prepare for the future. A great part of this is going to be education.

In this particular session this afternoon what I have picked up on is that we have a need now to educate the different generations. There are different ways and different methods we are going to have to implement. There are a lot of children out there that we are going to have to establish mores and tell them this is not acceptable behavior.

I also have heard from you that we need more people doing more of this. Probably if CRS gets more funding they can go put out more workshops like the one they had in April. That would be one way.

What do you see as the first priority area that we as a Commission should be trying to address? I know the crisis is on the campuses. Is that where we go first? Is that who we go talk to? What do you recommend we do at this point?

DR. WILSON: I think the Commission ought to make some decisions as to what it perceives as the problem. You have had a wide spectrum of opinion here, going from the problem is the minorities themselves to maybe this is something we ought to do something about. That doesn't make it easy to come to some agreement on what kind of position you have.

Assuming that through some startling intellectual exercise you come to some recognition that indeed there might be racial problems on our college campuses, then it seems to me as though the Commission ought to establish some kind of model programs that it can advise institutions they might undertake. Certainly the Penn State experience is the kind of program that the American Council on Education has been recommending and does recommend in its campus handbook, a comprehensive effort that does not address just the issue of the racial incident, which is what most institutions do: "Oh, somebody put a piece of graffiti up on the black counselor's door. Let's find out who did it and deal with that."

That is not the problem. That's a symptom of the problem. If we recognize that it is a symptom of a broader problem that is systemic to the institution, then it seems to me the Commission can very well identify some model elements of programs.

We do identify a number of institutions in that handbook that have also done outstanding jobs. The Commission could build on those kind of activities that we have initiated to be able to advise institutions on the various kinds of things that Ms. Flores-Hughes talked about in dealing with recruitment, retention, campus climate, environmental assessment, and all of those elements that need to be dealt with.

That is the kind of leading role, which is one I mention in the formal testimony that I have submitted to you, that the Civil Rights Commission could play, that is — I know this is dangerous — taking a proactive stand on civil rights.

MR. LEVINE: If you take a look at any system, higher education or elementary or secondary schools, one has to say that the issue and the problem has to be touched at every level. When we are advocating a systemic approach, we are talking about something like this. We are talking about clear policies on any acting out, any action of bigotry against any racial, ethnic or religious group.

Those policies to be published in a handbook and become part of the enforceable law of the institution with serious punishment, immediate punishment. We always say if there are extenuating circumstances, punish the crime and save the child, but punish the crime first.

We are talking about a review not only of policies, some of which, by the way, are dictated by federal and state law and which many people on campuses are unaware that they are not obeying the law in certain places, but we are talking about an analysis of student campus involvement.

We advocate ethnically related and religious related activities. We think it is important for self-enhancement. But we also say that on many campuses where you have activity that is involved on that level you do not have common ground. The question is, can you have both ethnically identified, racially identified, sexually identified special activity which is legitimate but you must also have common ground, that these kids have to have a place where they meet together. It is unbalanced if you have one without the other.

One other suggestion on faculty. Faculty must review courses. I disagree totally with Dr. Short. There are magnificent intellectually significant courses that do lead to changing attitudes. My attitudes about life were changed dramatically by greater education. It doesn't hurt if those courses are taught by sensitive instructors and professors who also know how to relate to what the educators call affective education.

Nothing like what you say has ever happened in any situation that I have been involved in. So I do think you build some straw men. I will give you an example. We use a technique called ethnic sharing. It doesn't tell people what kind of attitudes to have, but by sharing anecdotal stories about your life and your family and your background, it teaches by inference and by connections and by communication appreciation of each other. It is quite simple to do. It is quite replicable, quite harmless, and does not confront on the deepest level the fears that people have about just regurgitating attitudes.

There is a pedagogy over here that has been developed that is not being used, but there are a lot of myths about the pedagogy that is holding us back. I do believe you did spread a few myths, Dr. Short. That is not what sensitivity training does at its best; that is not what multicultural courses do at their best. You were giving us a worst case possibility. Anything is possible. What you are saying happens does not happen in most cases.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Francis, I want to give you an opportunity to ask any questions, if you feel so disposed.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I do feel so disposed, but I would like to reserve my questions.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY: I think Dr. Balch has a reply.

DR. BALCH: I think Tom probably should reply since he has just been challenged.

DR. SHORT: I think what Mr. Levine just said is true up to a point, as a criticism of me. I have featured the worst case and I don't mean to deny that there is a best case also. I plead ignorance on the question of sensitivity training, but let me talk about multicultural education in the form of courses offered for college credit and if many get their way are required of all students.

In the first place, I don't deny that attitudes can and should be changed in college. What I fear is the plan that we will organize our facts and our arguments and our theories around is the aim of changing attitudes in a particular direction. Certainly my attitudes were changed in college. I am not surprised that Mr. Levine's attitudes were changed in college. I wonder, however, whether his teachers had planned that particular change that took place in him.

MR. LEVINE: I hope they did.

DR. SHORT: As far as the worst case scenario is concerned, let me just quote something that I wrote about the Kenyon College "University proposals." It shows that the worse case is certainly not untypical.

In the interest of exposing the real thrust of the "cultural diversity" movement, I will not describe the proposals contained in the 1987 "Report to the President" by Kenyon's Task Force on Diversity. The entire report is 8 single-spaced pages, plus three pages of appendices, containing 63 proposals grouped under five headings: "Curricular Concerns," "Student Concerns," "Faculty Recruitment," "Staff Recruitment," "Student Recruitment." The three recruitment sections propose specific goals and strategies for increasing the numbers of minority, especially black, persons on campus. Nothing conceivable is omitted: there is even a demand for more minority janitors ("a slightly lower priority issue"). Yet the 45 proposals in these sections contain no real surprises: that black faculty should be hired to teach Afro-American studies, and enticed to come by being offered higher salaries or reduced teaching loads, is as predictable as it is objectionable. Similarly, the proposals under "Curricular Concerns" are familiar to all who have read about the developments at Stanford. It is the proposals grouped under "Student Concerns" that are revelatory.

First of all, a nasty edge is present throughout. For example, a multi-cultural center is suggested as "the physical focus of *this issue* on campus [my emphasis]." No antecedant for "this issue" can be found in the text, but clearly its authors are thinking of the center as a place to raise "issues," and not as a place to

foster the appreciation of cultures. Similarly, a student group is proposed that will "promote awareness"—not, as you might think, of diverse cultures, but—"of racism." Again a forum is proposed in which minority students can "articulate grievances," and events are sugested to "heighten awareness of minority issues." In all of the nine proposals in this section there is no suggestion that anything cultural might be celebrated. Instead, the object is to teach that minorities have been victimized by American society and are still oppressed by their fellow citizens.

In many like documents produced at other colleges and universities, there is a similar emphasis on investigating alleged instances of bias or insensitivity, particularly on the part of faculty. This past Spring (1988), the President of the University of Vermont signed a 16-point "agreement" with a group of minority protestors in which he committed the University to the usual list of curricular changes, minority recruitment goals, and innovations in campus life, including that "a disciplinary procedure with punitive sanctions" will be established for anyone who even "insinuates racist remarks or actions" and that "the evaluation of faculty members includes an opportunity to comment on [their] inappropriate references to race." Furthermore, "Faculty will be evaluated on affirmative action"—presumably their willingness to implement its provisions. Also, participation in "a program in racial awareness and sensitivity" will be "considered as part of the evaluation process for all faculty . . . in reappointment, promotion and tenure, . . . and for annual salary review.

In addition to their emphasis on minority grievances, the Kenyon "diversity" proposals provide remarkable institutional support for the information, even enforcement, of racial and ethnic identification. They call for a separate program for minorities during freshman orientation, wherein "ties" among minority students will be formed. In addition, they proposed the creation of a new administrative position, Administrator for Minority Affairs, whose duties include counselling minority students in "maintaining their own cultural identity." Woe to the black student who doesn't like jazz or soul food and wants to study Chaucer and Spenser rather than Eldridge Cleaver and Alice Walker.

The importance of having an administrative officer whose job depends upon the continued separation of minority students from other students has not been lost on minority militants; such positions have been proposed at a wide variety of institutions. At the University of Wisconsin at Madison the proposal is for a vice-chancellor for ethnic/minority afairs; the president of Penn State has agreed to appoint "a vice president for cultural affairs for black students;" and so on. If past experience, for example,

at Cornell, is any guide, militant minority students will determine who is retained in these administrative positions.

Moreover, it is well-known that minority militants have often exerted tremendous pressure on other minority students to cleave to the minority group and to shun students and studies not identified with that group. The institutional support now being urged for separate minority organizations and minority facilities will further advance the political goals of minority militants. For they invariably dominate such organizations and control such facilities. The Vermont "agreement" begins this process early, by requiring the Minority Student Panel (on which no one may serve but minority students and two minority faculty) to be actively involved even in the *recruitment* of minority students and to be given "all appropriate information" on those admitted.

Despite the rhetoric of "pluralism" and of learning to appreciate cultures different from one's own, the real meaning of "cultural diversity" is racial politics. Not everyone who has jumped on this bandwagon understands the aims of the radical faculty who have nailed it together, but those aims are apparent on reflection: it is to build radically and ethnically separatist political movements, to fuel those movements by heightened resentment of (partly real yet greatly exaggerated, partly invented) oppression, and to produce a climate of acceptance for racial politics by eliciting "liberal guilt" in everyone else.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Steve, did you want to get on this?

DR. BALCH: Yes. I wanted to enter a caveat to what I saw as some of the rather inclusive strategies that are being suggested here. I think it is very important when the Commission defines its terms of inquiry that it looks at problems which in any environment would be considered, if not criminal, at least a serious lapse from accepted norms of civility and not try to reach to those aspects of college and university policy which deal with the essential intellectual freedom and intellectual dialogue that makes these kinds of institutions not only unique, but singularly productive in advancing our own thought even when many of the things that are said from time to time are things that we would strongly disagree with.

Obviously the things that the Commission should be concerned with are acts of personal injury, acts of vandalism and destruction of property, particularly where there is some kind of group hatred behind them, and also cases of clear discourtesy. I think, however, one has to make a distinction. We have to constantly keep reminding ourselves as a matter of self-discipline both as people who care for the life of the mind and as citizens of a country which values free speech almost above everything else that there is a distinction between expressing ideas that people

very much disagree with and that may even be wrong and personal insult.

If that is the line that can be drawn and if that is a distinction in force with common sense and good will, then I am all for both as a matter of institutional policy and a matter of the Commission's concern and emphasis on the importance of maintaining a civil and courteous life within our academic communities.

There are and have been a number of instances in recent times and probably many more that have not been well documented where that kind of concern has been carried further and has led to if not suppression, at least intimidation of people who had views that were either opprobrious to many or in some cases just opprobrious to a few.

For example, there is an instance at Harvard where a professor has withdrawn from teaching a course having to do with American immigration history because a small number of students in his class objected to certain characterization that he made — certainly not in any insulting language. The man is a distinguished scholar — about ethnic history in the United States. They did it on the grounds that he had been insensitive and they had somehow experienced an atmosphere of harassment and intimidation.

Well, all sorts of people are offended by all sorts of things, but as soon as that becomes an offense, as soon as that becomes something that draws penalties or even leads people to undergo tremendous pressure from their peers and others in the university community, you really have a problem.

A similar situation at the University of Pennsylvania. An adjunct professor made comments, basically fairly innocuous ones, but perhaps not altogether tactful, and was forced to withdraw from teaching for a semester and then finally as a condition for reemployment had to do public penance.

We were not dealing with insults in these cases; we were dealing with simply the expression of ideas that some people didn't like. If we lose sight of that distinction, then we are on a very slippery slope.

As far as teaching courses are concerned, I have taught lots of courses in the social sciences and I often teach it with an emphasis on history. I do, of course, make judgments from time to time. I let my students know my judgments are fallible. I cannot present material without characterizing it in some way, and I guess there is a hope way, way back in my consciousness that when the course is over the student will be closer to my belief than he was before. I do try to present a varying array of views on most issues in the realm that reasonable people can differ.

I think we are getting in very big trouble if we begin to see university instruction as basically a tendentious act, as an opportunity to promote right thinking rather than as far as we can see it present a truthful account of what happened, and even when we are dealing with ethics and morality, a truthful interpretation of what happened.

Reality is very complicated. When it is reduced to a simple formula that is supposed to lead people in the right direction, you have a coarsening of intellectual life and I think ultimately a distortion of the standards on which intellectual life must rest.

It is clear that if you are talking about the history of the United States or the history of western society, meaning, I guess, Europe, you have to talk about slavery. You have to talk about a variety of other forms of exploitation. On the other hand, I noticed at this very meeting when Dr. Short said that slavery was brought to an end on the basis of certain Anglo-Saxon principles of individual rights and freedom, I heard expression of disbelief, as if somehow that wasn't true.

I would refer anybody who is interested in the subject to a very interesting work by an Afro-American socialist at Harvard which documents the pervasiveness of slavery throughout the world, on every continent. In fact, in some cases surprisingly recent and aggravated in the 19th century. In Korea one third of the population were slaves. The Arab slave trade, largely preying on Africa, continued well into the 19th century, long after it had been abolished in the Atlantic.

The unique thing, it would seem to me, about western civilization is not that it had slavery but that it abolished slavery. Obviously it is a complicated question. When we start to present issues on the basis of fairly simple formulae whose purpose, it seems to me, is often to shame people, shame people perhaps for a good reason, to a higher and more sensitive consciousness, when we start using that as a device to shame people, I think we are not only breaching a very important rule of intellectual life, but I think we are going to have counterproductive results. People are going to realize that this is not true, that this is distorted; they are going to feel resentful.

MR. LEVINE: You are saying that there is no legitimate literature in the field of bigotry. I will challenge that. There is a lot of social science; there is a lot of social psychology in the field; there is a lot of practice in the field; there is a lot of knowledge in the field.

DR. BALCH: I didn't say that.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Irving, we have to give other people a shot.

DR. BALCH: I will yield the floor.

DR. DUNHAM: I would like to respond to the question I heard about what do you do next.

First of all, I think stronger and clearer signals from the Federal Government would help all of us. Right now people out there are saying we are not quite sure what the government is doing or wants to do and it makes our job more difficult.

Second, I think we need to educate the general public on the rationale for diversity. In an institution like ours it is more than just bringing in minority students and making them white in four years. That is not what diversity is all about, but I think that is the perception. The booklet that was talked about earlier, "One Third of a Nation," has been an excellent document for us. We use it in about every speech we make. I think that is worth getting out to the public.

Third, if we could get more financial aid for our needy students, if we could get aid to every student at our university who has need for it, then we wouldn't have the students grousing about who gets aid and who doesn't get aid. The fact is we don't have enough money from the Federal Government and the state government and the university to fund all needy students at Penn State. If we could solve that problem alone, that would help us a great deal in dealing with diversity.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I promised Commissioner Guess an opportunity.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Mr. Cheng has a comment.

MR. CHENG: Thank you very much.

I heartily second what Dr. Dunham said. I think the federal component is really very important and that is something that I think the Commission can do.

Also, I was wondering if the Commission would be able to educate us, the students, in terms of what you can do. I consider myself fairly versed in these matters, but still I am cloudy as to who you can talk to in the Executive branch or Legislative branch, and what powers you have.

I think other students need to know also if something happens to them where they can go. I would encourage that on an educational level directly to students you should encourage universities to let them know where to go if something happens.

DR. WILSON: I wish it were possible for universities to live outside of the society of which they are a part. Unfortunately, they do not. The mythical descriptions that I have heard today about the pristine life of the mind and about the prejudicing of the educational process sounded to me like something that exists in a country that I have not been a part of.

I live in a country in which the educational process has been politicized since the day that Harvard opened in 1636. I have lived long enough to see faculty members dismissed from their

classes not for what they taught but for who their friends were and what political parties they belong to. This all went on while academics stood silently by and allowed it to happen to their fellow academics.

To now talk about the purity of the academic enterprise as though to even raise questions of racism in American society as something that trashes the purity of the academy is bullshit, if you will pardon my putting that on the record.

To say the line must stop with the Commission only talking about people beating up other people or people writing "niggers" on doors or people committing criminal acts but leave the rest of it alone as though that has nothing to do with the enterprise is absurd.

If you are really serious about dealing with racism on college campuses, you must deal with it root and branch where it exists, in the administration, in the faculty, in the curriculum, and in the practices that all of those individuals engage in. That is where it begins and that is where attitudes are created. As my friend Bud Hodgkinson said, it is all one system; it starts in kindergarten and it goes through graduate school, and each one of those institutions have a role in rooting it out.

If you are only going to talk about criminal acts or uncivil acts or acts of impoliteness, turn it over to the legal authorities or the local police and let them take care of it. There is no reason to hold these hearings. I suggest what is going on on college campuses pervades the entire campus.

I am pleased to see the leadership at Kenyon College, Phil Jordan, moving in the spirit of changing things and I hope as those things change dramatically, Professor Short, that you will be there when that new vision of higher education being non-racist appears on your campus.

MR. LEVINE: For the record, I want to say that the American Jewish Committee one hundred percent supports what Dr. Reginald Wilson has just said. It is absurd that in the field of prejudice reduction people believe that courses that are related to dealing with prejudice, dealing with multiculturalism, dealing with the history of the major social issues in our society around race, ethnicity and religion will automatically be illegitimate. That is absurd to me.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: This whole thing is getting very interesting now as we are about to close down. Commissioner Guess has his shot next.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I just wanted to make the observation there is a continuing and ongoing conversation between the chair of the subcommittee and myself pertaining to self-selection, pertaining to perceptions and how one perceives one's place in society and what expectations we offer for our young people as

they come into the ranks of educated men and women. One of the things I have trouble grappling with is particularly as it relates to the American Jewish Committee. I have been trying to become a candidate for a position in the American Jewish Community.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Send us a resume.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: You keep telling me, though, Mr. Vice Chairman, that I am not qualified because of the fact that I am not Jewish, that there are no non-Jewish executives within the American Jewish Committee, that its purpose is to promote to Jewish values as it relates to bigotry and prejudice, but yet one has to be Jewish in a self-selection process in order to advocate these values. To me that borders on the brink of hypocrisy unless someone can show me something different.

MR. LEVINE: I didn't know that that was on the agenda. Just for clarification, there is a history in the bylaws that go back to 1906. Maybe that is what you ought to argue with.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I am not going to come to grips with this other than to say that there are no Jews as priests in the Roman Catholic Church.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: And I would not expect to be a candidate to be a rabbi either, Mr. Vice Chairman. I'm not going to let you get away with that.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We will have to solve this one, Francis, outside of the discussion of campus bigotry and racism.

MR. LEVINE: I hope this is not in the record as a part of this proceeding.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: It is being taped, but we can handle it. The world won't come apart from any of this comment.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: Do I get a chance to say my most important comment?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: The Commissioners always get the last say.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: I have been taking notes. We all agree the problem exists and there is more than one part responsible for this.

I would like to address this especially to Mr. Cheng. As far as I am concerned, the government also should be greatly responsible for this. We have the Department of Education, Department of Justice, and also other departments. They are all responsible for civil rights.

Dr. Dunham has gone, but during the five-minute recess I had complimented him on the beginning of this action by the institution administration. I thought that was at least a beginning.

The third one is to educate the public. Let's start with the PTA, from the bottom up. It should start from the grade school, high school, and college, and so on.

I want to give Mr. Cheng a message that I am getting an education here but I also use these data banks and I have feedback, and this is my reaction.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we promised to break this at five. I have exercised a great deal of restraint. I have not asked any questions or commented myself. Can you spend a few more minutes? I am prepared to spend a few more minutes.

I am going to call on John Eastman, who may have the responsibility of trying to make some sense out of all this.

MR. EASTMAN: Continuing on the issue of free speech that we are grappling with defining, I would like to pose two anecdotal stories that we have heard reported in the briefing we put together.

The Young Americans for Freedom placed posters around one of the campuses in Pennsylvania arguing against homosexual behavior. They did not tear similar posters arguing in favor of homosexual behavior down, which would have been an act of vandalism, but they put those up. Joan Weiss' group, the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, has classified that as an incident.

The second case is in the teaching of course work on the American Constitution. I have seen a number of classes that teach that the Constitution was a racist document because it treated blacks as three-fifths of a man. When I have raised objections to that, that it rather made the distinction between free people and slave people — and there were free blacks — and that was the intent of that, that is accused of being a racist comment.

In light of those two questions, where does the line from free speech end and the one from racism start.

MR. CHENG: We had tried for about five months to come up with anecdotal incidents, saying this is harassment, this is not. The problem with that is you cannot draw the line specifically. There are some principles that we have come up with. People hold a right to put up a poster saying we disagree with gay people and this is what we think. When it fringes upon personal harm, when you say I'm going to bash in your head because you're gay, that is an entirely different thing.

I think the best strategy is to say that harassment is not permitted. You will find that legal scholars will agree you can't draw the specific line, but there are certain things, like threatening speech and other things like that that are clear.

MR. EASTMAN: Let me pursue that. Then you are saying that one incident that I described would not have been an incident, yet it was defined as such.

MR. CHENG: If you say something about a group, that can't be held against you because you are entitled to that thought no matter how distasteful it is, but if it is transferred on to an individual or if you stand up in a crowded movie theater and shout "fire!" and incite violence in that sense, that is not protected either. Stanford tried saying, well, if you say things about race or whatever, and the whole campus just fell apart. They had to revise that.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I want to raise a question with this panel. Maybe it is two questions linked together.

There are some extraordinary contradictions and complexities in this issue. I think John has very accurately described one complexity. One of our major experts in this field described the episode that John has described to us as an act of harassment, and she is one of the important players in this game. The issue I want to address is the question of teaching group identity and how that can impinge upon antiracial or anti-Semitism feelings.

A number of years ago I interviewed Bayard Rustin on the subject of anti-Semitism in the black community. He made an observation to me that makes rather difficult the exchange between Short and Levine. His argument was that throughout the evolution of the black struggle as it evolved through its various forms whenever there was a growth of nationalism there you would find a growth of anti-Semitism. He focused on the integration aspects of the black struggle.

DR. WILSON: He's wrong, but that's all right.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: These are issues that are debatable.

The point is, if you teach group identity, which we all wish to do, which then begins to move off into a pattern sometimes of group nationalism —

MR. LEVINE: It doesn't have to at all

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: It doesn't have to.

MR. LEVINE: As a matter of fact, there is a real contradiction over there. You are defining group identity wrong, Murray. Teaching group identity is when we say to a high school literature teacher, if you have 25 black children in your class in a workshop, what black novels have you assigned to those children and other children? We say, look, one of the things you must do in order to relate to the child's group identity is to make sure that in your literature course they read something that relates to themselves and their background and their group and that they also read another novel that relates to somebody else in the class.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: That's the nice part of group identity.

MR. LEVINE: That's not the nice part. That is what we are talking about in terms of group identity. What you are talking about is not what we are talking about.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Stay with the argument and please don't get upset. The point is we want people to read novels about other groups they are not familiar with. We want people to read *The Fortunate Pilgrim* so they learn something about Italians. That is the easy and nice part.

MR. LEVINE: No, it's not easy, because they are not being assigned. That is why we are insisting that they do it.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: We like that and accept that. But as the group identity experience moves forward you often are confronted with issues of group separatism. Groups begin to form their own eating, residential, et cetera.

DR. WILSON: That is not a natural outgrowth of group activity.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: It can be part of a continuum.

DR. WILSON: Then say it can be a part of it, but don't say that is a natural outgrowth.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: It is not automatic, I know, but it can be part of a continuum. I think the issues get a little bit complicated.

DR. BALCH: I think there is a problem in assuming that teaching a certain kind of subject is going to lead in a particular direction. It may well be that in teaching about the different cultures of various groups those who are not part of the group will develop sympathy and appreciation for various things that other groups have done, but they may also find some of them alien and foreign. They may see in the history of the group patterns of aggression and exploitation directed at their own people. Knowledge does not necessarily make for sense of fellowship.

When I hear the kinds of characterization of western civilization, I frequently found not only in our university but outside of it that the people who hold those views about the West (a) claim to know something about it and (b) don't like it.

Maybe they are right, but if they are right, they are an illustration of the fact that studying of a society does not make you feel better about it, and they would also be an illustration of the fact that if they taught their views in the classroom they would probably not get the people who came from that background to either sympathize with their view or, if they were won over, to feel better about themselves.

A white student who is constantly told that his culture is not only in the past but in the present largely pervaded by racism is either going to end up feeling very hostile to the person who brings them that message, or he is going to end up feeling very guilty about himself.

If someone believes that is true and they are teaching it, I think that it is their duty to present that, but it should not be taken

as an assumption that talking about these issues will necessarily make people feel better.

I also agree that to the extent we want to socialize our new generation into values of tolerance and brotherhood, I think that kind of character building process is going to be effective and most appropriate at the lower grade school levels and not in institutions which are designed to try to figure out the ways things are.

Truth was somewhat also pooh-poohed a little while ago. If it is going to be pooh-poohed, if you don't really care about what is true and what is not, I don't know what we are doing here presenting our views to the Commission. I assume we are not feeding you a line. I assume we are trying to tell you how the world actually works.

DR. WILSON: It would be interesting to find out who around this table, unless they are gone, is pooh-poohed too.

DR. BALCH: I heard that everything was political and that my defense of the university as a place where truth was sought was naive. I suspect that is not giving truth its due.

MR. LEVINE: Dr. Balch, if you were teaching a university course on the Holocaust, would you then anticipate that those who are learning about the Holocaust would automatically assume that western civilization was horrible?

DR. BALCH: No.

MR. LEVINE: If you taught the Holocaust and they assumed that, would you worry a great deal about their assumption or would you applaud them for their intelligence?

DR. BALCH: On the other hand, if I were teaching a course in German studies and I made it nothing but the Holocaust, I would think (1) it was dishonest and (2) my students would have every right to be offended, particularly if they were German.

MR. LEVINE: Would you say that teaching about the Holocaust is illegitimate academically?

DR. BALCH: No. Teaching about slavery isn't illegitimate either.

MR. LEVINE: Can it do some good?

DR. BALCH: Yes. It should be part of every curriculum because it is a real fact and because we should know about it.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Commissioner Buckley.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY: The only thing I wanted to say was part of the sensitizing of individuals and the community and the people to this problem is going to have to be that when we present these issues we have to be careful about the frame of mind in which we present it. You can present facts, but you present both sides of the issue. It works in the classrooms now. They are telling us how to do it as educators now. It can work, but we have to be able to control some of that emotion that gets involved and gets in the way of being able to talk about it.

DR. BALCH: If I taught the Holocaust, I would not present both sides of the issue because I don't think there is another side. It depends on the issue. Nor would I do that with slavery.

DR. WILSON: Then the pursuit of truth does not necessarily mean presenting all of the aspects.

DR. BALCH: No. It means what is true is true.

DR. WILSON: You just answered my question, and that is that the academy is as politicized as every other institution and you ought to deal with that.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I think that is as far as we can go today in the resolution of these questions.

I want to thank all of you. We have much to chew on. I think the project is manageable, unlike some of the projects that we have at the Civil Rights Commission. I think we can take the material you have given us and the literature that has been developing in this field, the discussion, and I think we can come up and say something useful and helpful in terms of programs that can be undertaken.

Thank you again for joining us.

(Whereupon at 5:20 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

APPENDIX

Papers and materials presented at the May 18, 1989, briefing are listed below:

"Introductory Remarks," Honorable Murray Friedman, Vice Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and Chairman, Subcommittee on Campus Bigotry.

"Testimony," Grace Flores-Hughes, Director, Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

"Contemporary Anti-Semitism on Campus," actual testimony presented, Dr. Jeffrey A. Ross, Director, Department of Campus Affairs/Higher Education, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

"Update materials to December 1988 report," submitted in absentia by Joan C. Weiss, Executive Director, National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence.

"Testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary for hearings on the Commission on Racially Motivated Violence Act of 1988, July 12, 1988," Reginald Wilson, Ph.D., Director, Office of Minority Concerns, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

"Outline for Briefing on Bigotry and Violence on College Campuses," Patrick S. Cheng, Junior, Yale College, and member, Campuses Against Racist Violence.

"A 'New Racism' on Campus?" Thomas Short, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Kenyon College.

"Racism in the Reagan Years: Resurgence or Reaffirmation?" included with permission of Frederick A. Hurst, Esq., Commissioner, Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination.

"The New Bigotry on Campus," included with permission of the late John Adams Wettergreen, Professor of Political Science at San Jose State University and member, California Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

"Outline for Remarks," Irving M. Levine, National Affairs Director, American Jewish Committee.

"The Recoloring of Campus Life: Student Racism, Academic Pluralism, and The End of a Dream," included with permission of Shelby Steele, Associate Professor of English at San Jose University.

The following organizations are sources of additional information about campus bigotry and violence.

Center for Democratic Renewal, P.O. Box 50469, Atlanta, GA 30302

Center for the Study and Prevention of Campus Violence, Towson State University, Towson, MD 21204–7097

National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, 31 South Greene Street, Baltimore, MD 21201

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 823 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017

Southern Poverty Law Center, 400 Washington, Ave., Montgomery, AL 36104, or P.O. Box 50469, Atlanta, GA 30302

80

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1990 — 277-447 20944

UNITED STATES COMMISSION
ON CIVIL RIGHTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20425

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, $300

SPECIAL 4TH CLASS RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
US COMMISSION ON
CIVIL RIGHTS G-73